

Die Armen im Buch Jesaja. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte des AT (*)

Eines der bislang auffälligsten Ergebnisse aus der noch andauernden Methodendiskussion in der aktuellen alttestamentlichen Forschung ist die Tatsache, daß die biblischen Bücher als solche bzw. Bücherkompositionen in die Mitte des akademischen Interesses rücken⁽¹⁾. Dieser Paradigmenwechsel bedeutet, daß es anstelle des einzelnen Prophetenspruches verstärkt um das Prophetenbuch als literarisches Opus in seiner Ganzheit geht. In der Beschäftigung mit dem Liedgut des biblischen Israel geht der Weg von der Psalmen- zur Psalterexegese⁽²⁾. Dieser neue Weg der Forschung bedeutet keineswegs ein flächiges Hinübergleiten über die vorliegende Textgestalt mit ihren vielschichtigen Problemen, sondern den Versuch, aus der gewachsenen Endgestalt der Bücher ihre pragmatische und theologische Zielsetzung abzulesen. Hinsichtlich des methodischen Ansatzes kann es nicht um ein Entweder-Oder von Synchronie und Diachronie gehen, sondern um ein verantwortetes Miteinander, das als "diachron reflektierte Synchronie" umschrieben werden kann.

Kommen die biblischen Bücher in ihrer gewachsenen Endgestalt in den Blick, dann werden in ihnen auch die Sammler, Tradenten, Fortschreiber und Einschreiber erkennbar, die an diesen "literarischen Kathedralen" in größerem oder auch kleinerem Maße

(*) *Erich Zenger zum 60. Geburtstag.*

Stark erweiterte Fassung des ersten Teils der Antrittsvorlesung an der Universität Nimwegen, "De Armen in het boek Jesaja. Een bijdrage tot de literatuurgeschiedenis van het Oude Testament", gehalten am 5.3.1999.

(¹) C. CONROY, "Reflections on the Present State of Old Testament Studies", *Greg* 73 (1992) 597-609 (Lit!); zur Prophetenbuch-Exegese, J.D. NOGALSKI, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW 218; Berlin 1993); E. BOSSHARD-NEPUSTIL, *Rezeptionen von Jesaja 1-39 im Zwölfprophetenbuch*. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Verbindung von Prophetenbüchern in babylonischer und persischer Zeit (OBO 154; Fribourg 1997); O. H. STECK, *Die Prophetenbücher und ihr theologisches Zeugnis*. Wege der Nachfrage und Fahrten zur Antwort (Tübingen 1996).

(²) Dazu bes. E. ZENGER, "Der Psalter als Buch. Beobachtungen zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Funktion", *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum* (ed. E. ZENGER) (HBS 18; Freiburg i.Br. 1998) 1-57 (Lit!).

mitgebaut haben. Die Tatsache, daß die schriftlichen Monumente des biblischen Israel erst in nachexilischer Zeit ihren Abschluß fanden, darf als gesichert gelten; zugleich ist es sehr wahrscheinlich, daß sich in dem räumlich sehr begrenzten nachexilischen Israel Schreiber und Bearbeiter der religiösen Traditionen kannten bzw. voneinander wußten. Daß die Erfahrungen des Exils die Produktion von "Überlebensstrategien" erheblich gefördert haben, liegt auf der Hand; daß sie sehr unterschiedlich ausgefallen sind, liegt nicht zuletzt an den konkurrierenden Zielvorstellungen der Endbearbeiter der biblischen Bücher⁽³⁾.

Wenn dem so ist, stellt sich die Anschlußfrage, ob es zwischen den Baumeistern dieser literarischen Werke Verbindungen gab, deren Spuren jetzt noch sichtbar gemacht werden können. Diese Fragestellung geht über die nach Allusionen, Zitaten und inhaltlichen Verbindungen zwischen einzelnen Büchern hinaus, da sie es auf gemeinsame oder auch konkurrierende Zielsetzungen, d.h. auf theologische Positionen abgesehen hat. Als Prolegomenon eines solchen Unternehmens, Verbindungen zwischen biblischen Büchern in deren Endgestalt auf die pragmatischen Positionen ihrer Trägergruppen sichtbar werden zu lassen, soll die Stellung der Armen im Buche Jesaja dienen. Anlaß für diese Fragestellung ist die Tatsache, daß in *diesem* prophetischen Buch die Thematik der Armen durchlaufend zu finden ist, was Rückschlüsse auf die besondere gesellschaftliche Zielsetzung der Jesajabuch-Tradenten zuläßt.

I. Zur Armutsdiskussion im AT⁽⁴⁾

Denkt man in christlichen Kreisen über die Armutsfrage innerhalb der hebräischen Bibel nach, dann geht der Blick meist hauptsächlich, wenn nicht gar ausschließlich auf die prophetische

⁽³⁾ M.E. könnte sich hier auch eine Vermittlung zwischen "Religionsgeschichte Israels" und "Theologie des Alten Testaments" abzeichnen; dazu *Religionsgeschichte Israels oder Theologie des Alten Testaments?* (JBTh 10; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1995).

⁽⁴⁾ Siehe u.a. W.W. Graf BAUDISSLIN, "Die alttestamentliche Religion und die Armen", *PrJ* 149 (1912) 193-231; H.A. BRONGERS, "Rijkdom en armoede in Israel", *NedTTs* 29 (1975) 20-35; H. BRUPPACHER, *Die Beurteilung der Armut im Alten Testament* (Gotha – Stuttgart 1924); A. CAUSSE, *Les "Pauvres" d'Israël. Prophètes, Psalmistes, Messianistes* (Strasbourg 1922); R.J. COGGINS, "The Old Testament and the Poor", *ET* 99 (1987) 11-14; J.M. DAWSEY, "The Biblical Authority of the Poor", *ET* 101 (1990) 295-298; A. de la FUENTE, "El

Kritik, wie sie besonders scharf und prägnant im Buch Amos formuliert ist. Es hat dann den Anschein, die Propheten seien durchgehend Sozialreformer gewesen, die aufgrund ihrer ethisch-religiösen Grundsätze geradezu als Vorläufer der allgemeinen Menschenrechte gelten könnten⁽⁵⁾. In Wirklichkeit jedoch sind die Aussagen über die Armen im *corpus propheticum* viel dünner gesät als gemeinhin angenommen.

Der Überbetonung der prophetischen Kritik zugunsten der Armen entspricht in christlichen Kreisen dagegen eine Unterbelichtung der Texte aus den Gesetzeskorpora (Bundesbuch, Deuteronomium, Heiligkeitgesetz), obwohl gerade diese Texte sehr präzise eine systematische Armutsbekämpfung fordern⁽⁶⁾.

problema de la pobreza en la Biblia", *RET* 49 (1989) 431-448; A. GELIN, *Les Pauvres de Yahvé* (Paris 1956); D.E. GOWAN, "Wealth and Poverty in the Old Testament. The Case of the Widow, the Orphan, and the Sojourner", *Int* 41 (1987) 341-353; A. KUSCHKE, "Arm und reich im Alten Testament mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der nachexilischen Zeit", *ZAW* 57 (1939) 31-57; B. LANG, "The Social Organization of Peasant Poverty in Biblical Israel", *JSOT* 24 (1982) 47-63; C. VAN LEEUWEN, *Le développement du sens social en Israël avant l'ère chrétienne* (SSN 1; Assen 1955); J.M. LIAÑO, "Los pobres en el Antiguo Testamento", *EstBib* 25 (1966) 117-167; V. LIBERTI (ed.), *Ricchezza e povertà nella bibbia* (Roma 1991); I. Loeb, *La littérature des pauvres dans la Bible* (Paris 1892); N. LOHFINK, "'Option für die Armen'. Das Leitwort der Befreiungstheologie im Lichte der Bibel", *StZ* 203 (1985) 449-464; Ders., "Von der 'Anawim-Partei' zur 'Kirche der Armen'. Die bibelwissenschaftliche Ahnentafel eines Hauptbegriffs der 'Theologie der Befreiung'", *Bib* 67 (1986) 153-175; R. MARTIN-ACHARD, "Yahvé et les 'anawim", *ThZ* 21 (1965) 349-357; J. VAN DER PLOEG, "Les pauvres d'Israël et leur piété", *OTS* 7 (1950) 236-270; M. SCHWANTES, *Das Recht der Armen* (BEvT 4; Frankfurt/M. 1977); siehe auch den Sammelband *Evangelizare pauperibus*. Atti della XXIV settimana biblica (Brescia 1978).

⁽⁵⁾ K. KOCH, "Die Entstehung der sozialen Kritik bei den Profeten", *Probleme biblischer Theologie*. Festschrift G. von Rad (Hrsg. H. W. WOLFF) (München 1971) 236-257; W. DIETRICH – M. SCHWANTES (Hrsg.), *Der Tag wird kommen*. Ein interkontextuelles Gespräch über das Buch des Propheten Zefanja (SBS 170; Stuttgart 1996).

⁽⁶⁾ R. ALBERTZ, "Der Kampf gegen die Schuldenkrise — das Jubeljahrgesetz Levitikus 25", in: Ders., *Der Mensch als Hüter seiner Welt*. Alttestamentliche Bibelarbeiten zu den Themen des konziliaren Prozesses (Stuttgart 1990) 40-60; R. ALBERTZ, "Die Theologisierung des Rechts im Alten Israel", in: Ders. (Hrsg.), *Religion und Gesellschaft*. Studien zu ihrer Wechselbeziehung in den Kulturen des Antiken Vorderen Orients (AOAT 248; Münster 1997) 115-132; H.J. FABRY, "Deuteronomium 15. Gedanken zur

Untersucht man die Armutsthematik in den Schriftpropheten⁽⁷⁾, stellt man entgegen der landläufigen Meinung fest, daß in einer Vielzahl von Prophetenbüchern die armenspezifischen Ausdrücke wie דל, אביון, עני überhaupt nicht vorkommen, so u.a. bei Hosea, Micha, Nahum, Haggai. Selbst die Propheten, die sehr wohl Sozialkritisches zu bieten haben, wie z.B. Micha, Nahum und Maleachi, sprechen an keiner Stelle von den Armen unter Verwendung der gängigen Vokabeln. Eine eigenartige Sonderstellung nimmt das Buch Hosea ein, in dem die Armutsthematik überhaupt nicht auftaucht!

Aber auch in den Prophetenbüchern, in denen die armenspezifischen Begriffe vorkommen, sind die Belege fast an zwei Händen abzuzählen. Das Buch Amos spricht an 4 Stellen über Arme (Am 2,6-8; 4,1-2; 5,11-12; 8,4-6) und verwendet dabei 4mal דל(ים); 5mal אביון, und 2mal עני bzw. ענו, wobei die Begriffe völlig synonym gebraucht werden. Der Arme ist bei Amos der "verarmte Kleinbauer", der noch gerade über soviel Eigentum verfügt, daß er für die Oberschicht als Beute ihrer wirtschaftlichen Ausbeutung interessant ist, wie es M. Schwantes passend zusammenfasst: "...der Arme

Geschwister-Ethik im Alten Testament", ZAR 3 (1997) 92-111; R. KESSLER, "Das hebräische Schuldenwesen. Terminologie und Metaphorik", WuD 20 (1989) 181-195; N.P. LEMCHE, "The Manumission of Slaves – the Fallow Year – the Sabbatical Year – the Jubel Year", VT 26 (1976) 38-59; N. LOHFINK, "Armut in den Gesetzen des Alten Orients und der Bibel", in: Ders., *Studien zur biblischen Theologie*, (SBAB 16; Stuttgart 1993) 239-259; N. LOHFINK, "Das deuteronomische Gesetz in der Endgestalt – Entwurf einer Gesellschaft ohne marginale Gruppen", in: Ders., *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur III* (SBAB 20; Stuttgart 1990) 205-219; A. MEINHOLD, "Zur Beziehung Gott, Volk, Land im Jubel-Zusammenhang", BZ 29 (1985) 245-261; M.J. OOSTHUIZEN, "Deuteronomy 15:1-18 in Socio-Rhetorical Perspective", ZAR 3 (1997) 64-91; E. OTTO, "Programme der sozialen Gerechtigkeit. Die neuassyrische (an-)duraru-Institution sozialen Ausgleichs und das deuteronomische Erlaßjahr in Dtn 15", ZAR 3 (1997) 26-63; H.E. VON WALDOW, "Social Responsibility in the Older OT Law Tradition", CBQ 32 (1970) 182-204.

(7) Zum Thema Armut und Reichtum in der Spruchweisheit, siehe T. DONALD, "The Semitic Field of Rich and Poor in the Wisdom Literature of Hebrew and Accadian", OrAnt 3 (1964) 27-41; D.J. PLEINS, "Poverty in the Social World of the Wise", JSOT 37 (1987) 61-78; R.N. WHYBRAY, *Wealth and Poverty in the Books of Proverbs* (JSOTSS 99; Sheffield 1990); Ders., "The Vocabulary of Wealth and Poverty in the Book of Proverbs (10:1-22:16 and 25-29)", *Learning from the Sages. Selected Studies on the Book of Proverbs* (ed. R.B. ZUCK) (Grand Rapids 1995) 125-136.

ist einerseits ein zwar verarmter, aber doch noch grundbesitzender Vollbürger, er ist aber andererseits vollkommen verschuldet und daher Schuldklave" (*). Durch schlechte Ernten gezwungen, mußte er die im Altertum horrend zinsintensiven Kredite bei wohlhabenden Großgrundbesitzern aufnehmen, die nur darauf spekulierten, den Schuldner wegen lächerlicher Restbeträge, wie z.B. den Gegenwert von ein Paar Sandalen in die Schuldklaverei zu verkaufen (Am 2,6-8) (°). Nur bei Amos, und zwar im ersten Beleg, ist der so Verarmte als צדיק, als Gerechter, qualifiziert; dies nicht etwa, weil er moralisch unbescholten ist, sondern, weil er im Sinne der Anklage unschuldig ist.

Ausbeutung und Rechtsbeugung gehen Hand in Hand, so daß die einmal an den Rand Gedrängten schnell und unwiderruflich in die Armutsfalle geraten. Im Jeremiabuch findet sich nur an einer einzigen Stelle eine der Amos-Kritik ebenbürtige Aussage, wo es heißt: "Sie schaffen der Waise nicht Recht vor Gericht, und für die Sache der Armen treten sie nicht ein" (ומשפט אביונים לא שפטו) (Jer 5,28). Angesichts der gerechten Regierungsarbeit von Joschija kritisiert Jeremia bei dessen Nachfolger Jojakim die einem König nicht zu Gesicht stehende Mißachtung der sozial Schwachen: "Er hat dem Bedrückten und Armen zum Recht verholfen (דן דין עני ואביון). Deshalb ging es ihm gut (אז טוב). Heißt nicht das, mich kennen?" (Jer 22,16).

Im Gegensatz zu Amos findet sich aber gerade bei Jeremia eine inhärente Kritik an den Armen, wenn es in Jer 5,4 heißt: "Da dachte ich: nur die geringen Leute (דלים) sind so, sie handeln töricht. Denn sie kennen nicht den Weg Jahwes, noch das Recht ihres Gottes". Daß Jeremia die Oberschicht nicht besser beurteilt, sei zwar vermerkt, nimmt aber seine Kritik an der Ignoranz der Armen nicht weg. So ist es auch nicht verwunderlich, daß in Jer 39,10; 40,7 und 52,15-16 mit den "Armen" des Landes (דלח ארץ) die Habenichtse (אין להם מאומה) gemeint sind, die so besitzlos sind, daß sie für die Neu-Babylonier nicht einmal mehr zur Deportation in Frage kommen. So wird das Exil umfunktioniert: einst Strafe, nun Auszeichnung! Bemerkenswert ist noch der aus der Psalmensprache entlehnte Beleg in den sog. Konfessionen Jeremias: "Singet Adonai,

(*) SCHWANTES, *Recht*, 99; vgl. H.J. FABRY, "דל", *TWAT* II, 235-238.

(°) Dazu M. SILVER, *Prophets and Markets. The Political Economy of Ancient Israel* (Boston 1983).

lobpreiset Adonai, denn gerettet hat er das Leben des Armen (אֲבִיּוֹן) aus der Gewalt der Bösen" (Jer 20,13). Der verfolgte Prophet wird für die Frommen der nachexilischen Gemeinde zum hoffnungsvollen Zeichen, dass Gott auch sie in ihrer Anfechtung nicht im Stich lassen wird⁽¹⁰⁾.

Die magere Ausbeute hinsichtlich der Armenfrage wird auch im Falle des Ezechielbuches nicht besser: hier finden sich allein 3 Stellen, die explizit von den Armen sprechen und zwar fast immer in der bekannten und bereits geprägten Wendung עֲנִי וְאֲבִיּוֹן (Ez 16,49; 18,12; 22,29)⁽¹¹⁾. Es geht dabei vornehmlich um die Einreihung der sozialen Vergehen in die Kette anderer Verschuldungen (kultische Mißstände, Fremdgötterverehrung), deren sich Jerusalem und Juda schuldig machten. Jerusalems Mißachtung der Armen ist sogar noch schlimmer als die Frevel Sodoms (Ez 16,49). In die Liste der Vergehen, die jetzt jeder persönlich zu verantworten hat, ist auch die Unterdrückung des Armen und Elenden aufgenommen (עֲנִי וְאֲבִיּוֹן הוֹנָה) (18,12,17). Genau diesen Mißstand beklagt der Prophet gegenüber den im Land Zurückgebliebenen. Nun ist es der האֲרָץ, der für schwerste Unterdrückung verantwortlich ist, dem neben dem Armen und Elenden auch der Fremde (גֵּר) zum Opfer fällt (Ez 22,29). Die Tatsache, daß Ezechiel zum einen fast durchgehend die geprägte Formel עֲנִי וְאֲבִיּוֹן gebraucht und sie zum anderen immer in einer Auflistung von Vergehen stellt, deutet darauf hin, daß der Ausdruck ein literarischer Topos zu werden beginnt, bei dem die einstige Verankerung im Rechts- und Wirtschaftsleben zwar noch durchscheint, aber längst nicht mehr tragend ist.

Den letzten Beleg für "Arme" in der exilischen Prophetie bietet Sach 7,10, ein präzise auf den 7. Dezember 518 v. Chr. datierter Kultbescheid. Darin wird auf die Anfrage, ob man noch weiterhin Fastengottesdienste abhalten solle, mit Rekurs auf die vorexilischen Propheten geantwortet⁽¹²⁾: "Haltet gerechtes Gericht, und handelt ein jeder gütig und barmherzig an seinem Nächsten, und bedrückt nicht die Witwen und Waisen, den Armen (עֲנִי), und sinnet nicht Böses in

⁽¹⁰⁾ Ganz ähnlich ist der schwierige Vers Hab 3,14b zu deuten: die Nähe zu 3,13, wo es um JHWHs Hilfe zugunsten seines Volkes und seines Gesalbten geht, deutet darauf hin, unter עֲנִי in V 14 das gesamte Volk zu verstehen; anders SCHWANTES, *Recht*, 126-129.

⁽¹¹⁾ Dazu noch allein עֲנִי in Ez 18,17.

⁽¹²⁾ H. Graf REVENTLOW, *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi* (ATD 25/2; Göttingen 1993) 73-78.

euren Herzen, einer wider den anderen" (7,9b-10). Die Reihenfolge, erst "Witwe", dann "Waise", kommt allein noch im Bundesbuch (Ex 22,21) vor, worauf Sach 7,10 sicher anspielt. Daß er den Armen einfach in die Reihe der *personae miserae* setzt, beweist, daß dieser zur Zeit des ausgehenden 6. Jhd. nicht mehr der zwar verarmte, aber noch mit vollen Bürgerrechten ausgestattete Kleinbauer ist, mit dem man noch Kreditgeschäfte machen konnte (Ex 22,24), sondern der Sozialschwache schlechthin. Als solcher steht er in einer Reihe — heute würde man sagen mit den Sozialhilfeempfängern —, wie Witwe, Waise und Fremdling⁽¹³⁾. Ist der עני einmal auf die Stufe der *personae miserae* abgesunken, eine Entwicklung, vor der ihn die Sozialgesetzgebungen in Bundesbuch und Deuteronomium bewahren wollten, war der Weg frei, in ihm gemeinhin den Mittel- und daher auch Rechtlosen zu sehen, für den nicht mehr das Recht, sondern nur noch die nicht mehr einklagbare Caritas zuständig war.

Mit diesen Belegen sind bereits alle Stellen im *corpus propheticum* gesehen, die explizit von "Armen" handeln⁽¹⁴⁾; die Belege aus dem Buche Jesaja, aus Deutero-Sacharja und Zefanja, gilt es nun zu besprechen.

II. Die Armen im Jesajabuch

Überschaut man die Armen-Belege im Jesajabuch, so fällt auf, daß sie zum einen häufiger als im etwa gleich großen Jeremia- oder Ezechielbuch vorkommen und zum anderen, daß die Begriffe (עני/עניים) eindeutig dominieren⁽¹⁵⁾. Die Dominanz von עני/עני läßt eine Nähe zum Psalter vermuten, wo diese Begriffe am häufigsten

⁽¹³⁾ Siehe zu Fremdling, C. BULTMANN, *Der Fremde im antiken Juda* (FRLANT 153; Göttingen 1992); G. STEINS, "'Fremde sind wir...'. Zur Wahrnehmung des Fremdseins und zur Sorge für die Fremden in alttestamentlicher Perspektive", *JCSW* 35 (1994) 133-150.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Dazu noch die Belege in den Schriftpropheten für die 3 Gruppen der *personae miserae*: "Witwe(n)": Jes 1,17.23; 9,16; 10,2; 47,8; ("Witwenschaft": Jes 47,9; 54,4); Jer 7,6; 15,8; 18,21; 22,3; Ez 22,7; 44,22; Sach 7,10; "Waise(n)": Jes 1,17.23; 9,16; 10,2; Jer 5,28; 7,6; 22,3; 49,11; Ez 22,7; Hos 14,4; Sach 7,10; Mal 3,5; "Fremde(r)": Jes 14,1; Jer 7,6; Ez 22,7.29; 47,22.23; Sach 7,10; Mal 3,5.

⁽¹⁵⁾ אֲבִיּוֹתַי (ים) 14,30; 25,4; 29,19; 32,7; 41,17; (דִּלְיָם) 10,2; 11,4; 14,30; 25,4; 26,6; עֲנִיִּים/עֲנִיָּים 3,14.15; 10,2; 11,4; 14,32; 26,6; 29,19; 32,7; 41,17; 49,13; 58,7; 61,1; 66,2; dazu 48,10 "Ofen des Elends" (בְּכֹר עֲנִי); Zion als "Elende" (עֲנִיָּה) (51,21; 54,11); leidender Knecht (לַמַּעֲבֹד) (53,4.7).

zu finden sind. Die Stellen im Jesajabuch, die ohne die Verwendung obiger Begriffe von Armen handeln, sind schnell aufgezählt: zum einen die "Witwen/Waisen" in Jes 1,17.23 und zum anderen die Wehesprüche in 5,8-10 (ungerechter Reichtum) und 5,23 (ungerechte Justiz).

Eine eingehende Literar- und Redaktionskritik dieser Belege kann und muß an dieser Stelle nicht geliefert werden. Doch gegen die radikalsten Verfechter prophetischer Spätdatierungen⁽¹⁶⁾ ist einzuwenden, daß auch Überformungen durch Schüler- und Tradentenkreise das ursprüngliche Prophetenwort nicht obsolet machen, sondern es geradezu voraussetzen: ohne ein Traditionsgut von Einzelsprüchen oder Spruchsammlungen hätte sich auch keine Fortschreibungsaktivität entwickeln können.

1. Belege in Jes 1–39

Daß sich der Prophet Jesaja, ähnlich seinem Kollegen Amos im Nordreich, den sozialen Problemen Judas in der zweiten Hälfte des 8. Jh gestellt hat, darf als gesichert gelten⁽¹⁷⁾. Die Thematik der Rechtsbeugung zuungunsten der Armen und zur persönlichen Bereicherung der Einflußreichen prangert der 7. Weheruf in Jes 10,1-4 an. Seine Positionierung als Schlußklammer um die Denkschrift (6,1-8,18*) ist zwar redaktioneller Herkunft, hat aber die jesajanische Couleur bestens bewahrt⁽¹⁸⁾: Jesaja geht gegen die Verordner von Unrechtsgesetzen vor, die den Rechtsanspruch der Gebeugten wegdrücken und "das Recht der Elenden meines Volkes rauben". In 5,23 gilt die Anklage denen, die auf Grund von Bestechung den Frevler gerecht sprechen und dem Gerechten so sein Recht entziehen. Die inhaltliche Nähe zu den prophetischen Anklagen Michas (2,1-2) und Amos' mit dessen Identifizierung von 'arm' und 'gerecht' (Am 2,6; 5,12) ist dabei unüberhörbar.

Trotz dieser Nähe zu den kontemporären Prophetenkollegen ist bei der jesajanischen Diktion über die Armen eine Besonderheit zu

⁽¹⁶⁾ Siehe U. BECKER, *Jesaja – von der Botschaft zum Buch* (FRLANT 178; Göttingen 1997); dagegen J. BARTHEL, *Prophetenwort und Geschichte*. Die Jesajaüberlieferung in Jes 6-8 und 28-31 (FAT 19; Tübingen 1997).

⁽¹⁷⁾ U.a. E. BLUM, "Jesaja und der דבר des Amos. Unzeitgemäße Überlegungen zu Jes 5,25; 9,7-20; 10,1-4", *DBAT* 28 (1992/93) 75-95.

⁽¹⁸⁾ F. CRÜSEMANN, *Die Tora*. Theologie und Sozialgeschichte des alttestamentlichen Gesetzes (München 1992) 196, ist der Ansicht, in Jes 10,1-4 seien die Gesetze des Bundesbuches angesprochen; dazu kritisch U. Becker, *Jesaja*, 156, Anm. 165.

vermelden, die für den weiteren Gang der Begriffsgeschichte von größter Bedeutung ist: es handelt sich um die beginnende Gleichsetzung der Armen mit dem Volk JHWHs (עם יהוה). So sind die רלים, wörtlich die 'Niedergehaltenen', mit den 'Elenden meines Volkes' (עניי עמי) (Jes 10,2) identifiziert, wobei der konkrete, wirtschaftlich-soziale Armutskontext noch dominiert, was die anschließende Nennung von Witwe und Waise belegt. Diese Konstruktus-Verbindung kommt allein noch in Jes 14,32 und Ps 72,4 vor, wobei jeweils ein Jerusalemer Kontext maßgebend ist⁽¹⁹⁾.

Der Ausdifferenzierungsprozeß von ganz Israel als Volk JHWHs (vgl. das Weinberglied) hin zu allein den unterdrückten Armen läßt sich in Jes 3,14-15 beispielhaft beobachten. Diese Verse gehören nicht zum jesajanischen Grundbestand, sondern präzisieren und korrigieren das nachfolgende Weinberglied, sind diesem also auf synchroner Ebene vor-, auf der diachronen jedoch nachgeordnet⁽²⁰⁾. Während im Weinberglied das gesamte Volk unter prophetischer Anklage steht, ist es hier allein die Führungsriege, die sich vor Gott zu verantworten hat⁽²¹⁾. Die Ältesten seines Volkes und die Fürsten werden angeklagt *mein Volk*, nämlich die עניים zertreten und zermalmt zu haben⁽²²⁾. Hier steht man literaturgeschichtlich an der Schwelle der Armentheologie, in der die Mißhandelten die besonderen Günstlinge JHWHs sind. Aus dem partitiven Genitiv von Jes 10,2, wo die Armen ein Teil des Gottesvolkes waren (vgl. Ex 22,24) ist nun die Aussage erwachsen, die Armen und Elenden seien in besonderem Maße JHWHs Volk. Dabei handelt es sich hier noch nicht um die Aussonderung einer Bevölkerungsgruppe⁽²³⁾, sondern um den Vorzug Gottes zugunsten der Armen. Gerade ihnen gilt die

⁽¹⁹⁾ SCHWANTES, *Recht*, 105.

⁽²⁰⁾ So mit BECKER, *Jesaja*, 167: vgl. כרם und בער in 3,14b; und "wie kommt ihr dazu?" (5,4).

⁽²¹⁾ J. VERMEYLEN, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique*. Isaïe, I-XXXV, miroir d'un demi-millénaire d'expérience religieuse en Israël, tome I, (EB; Paris 1977) 163: "En Is. III,14, la vigne n'est pas l'Israël rebelle à l'Alliance, mais le peuple victime de ses dirigeants malhonnêtes".

⁽²²⁾ Nach SCHWANTES, *Recht*, 110, sind damit sowohl die lokalen Führer als auch die Beamtenschaft gemeint: "...es geht um alle (!) Funktionen an allen (!) Orten".

⁽²³⁾ BECKER, *Jesaja*, 168: "Die 'Elenden' des Gottesvolkes...sind die Jahwetreuen, die Frommen...Hier bahnt sich die weisheitliche Unterscheidung zwischen den Gottlosen, den רשעים, und den Gerechten, den צדיקים, an, wenngleich sie noch nicht begrifflich durchgeführt ist".

Zusage göttlicher Hilfe und göttlichen Eingreifens⁽²⁴⁾. Der Weg zu einer Armentheologie ist damit vorgegeben, die besonders gespeist ist aus dem Vertrauen auf JHWH als persönlichem Schutzgott, der auf dem Zionsberg seine Wohnung genommen hat.

Daß sich die Armen auf dem Zion, der irdischen Wohnstatt des göttlichen Königs geborgen fühlen können, verheißt ausdrücklich die redaktionelle Einschreibung von Jes 14,30.32 in das ursprüngliche Orakel Jesajas gegen Philistää (Jes 14,28-29.31). Dessen Verheißung, die assyrische Weltmacht werde bei seinem Zug nach Westen auch den westlichen Nachbarn Judas nicht verschonen, wurde durch die Zusage ergänzt, die "Erstgeborenen der Geringen (בְּכוֹרֵי דָלִים) werden Weide finden und die Armen (אֲבִיּוֹנִים) in Sicherheit lagern" (14,30a). Die Stelle für diese positive Verheißung ist gut gewählt, denn der Vergeltungswunsch gegen Philistää hat hier nichts mehr mit der Rivalität zur Zeit der beginnenden Monarchie in Israel unter Saul und David zu tun, sondern mit dem von den Nachfahren der Philister praktizierten Handel u.a. auch mit hebräischen Sklaven⁽²⁵⁾. Ist Philistää einmal durch Assur auf Befehl JHWHs vernichtet, brauchen sich die "Allerärmsten" auch nicht mehr zu fürchten, auf den Sklavenmärkten an der Küste verkauft zu werden.

Jes 14,32 präzisiert, wo die Armen diese Weideplätze finden können: "Was antwortet man den Boten des Volkes: Ja, JHWH hat Zion fest gegründet und in ihr finden die Elenden seines Volkes Zuflucht (וְרָבָה יְהוָה עִנִּי עִמּוֹ)". Der Ausdruck "Boten des Volkes" rekuriert dabei auf die Erzählung von der Belagerung Jerusalems durch Sanherib (vgl. 37,9-10). Die Errettung von Jerusalem und Zion aus den Händen des assyrischen Großkönigs im Jahre 701 v. Chr. gilt den Verfassern dieser armentheologischen Einschreibungen als Beweis für die Uneinnehmbarkeit des Gottesberges, der den Armen JHWHs Zuflucht und Schutz garantiert⁽²⁶⁾. Gegenüber 14,30 tritt in 14,32 der soziale Kontext völlig hinter der theologischen Aussage

(24) SCHWANTES, *Recht*, 111: "Es geht dabei aber nicht um die Aussonderung einer gottergebenen Kleingemeinde der Armen vom Volksganzen, sondern um die Unterstreichung, daß die sozial Schwachen den Angelpunkt des Gottesvolkes bilden".

(25) Siehe O. KAISER, *Der Prophet Jesaja*. Kapitel 13-39 (ATD 18; Göttingen 1983) 48, mit Hinweis auf Am 1,6-7; Ez 25,15; Zef 2,4-5 und Jer 47.

(26) Vgl. U. BERGES, *Das Buch Jesaja*. Komposition und Endgestalt (HBS 16; Freiburg 1998) 175-176.

zurück: Die Elenden seines Volkes sind nun eindeutig die JHWH-Frommen, die auf die rettende Gegenwart ihres Gottes auf dem Zion vertrauen (חסד). Die Parallele zu Zef 3,12 ist dabei deutlich: "Ich werde übrig lassen in deiner Mitte ein Volk, arm und bedürftig (עם עני ודל), und sie werden Zuflucht finden im Namen JHWHs (וחסו בשם יהוה)". Es kann nach dem zu Jes 14,30.32 Gesagten nicht erstaunen, daß auch in dieser Parallelstelle davon die Rede ist, wo der Schutzraum für die Armen zu finden ist: "auf meinem heiligen Berg" (בהר קדשי) (Zef 3,11b). Diese Formulierung wiederum ist besonders im Buche Jesaja beheimatet und zwar gegen Ende im Kontext der "Knechtsgemeinde" ⁽²⁷⁾.

Daß die erwartete Heilszeit im Buch Jesaja wie sonst in keinem anderen Prophetenbuch mit der gerechten Herrschaft des kommenden davidischen Sproßes zugunsten der Unterdrückten und Armen verbunden ist, ist auf den Jerusalemer Hintergrund der Jesajatradition zurückzuführen. Nach allgemein altorientalischer Vorstellung oblag es dem König, für Gerechtigkeit und Recht im Land zu sorgen ⁽²⁸⁾. In den Fortschreibungen innerhalb des Buches Jesaja finden sich ebenfalls Aussagen, die von der großen Hoffnung Zeugnis geben, die auf den kommenden Herrscher gesetzt werden. Wie immer man auch die redaktionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhänge von Jes 7,14; 9,1-6 und 11,1-9 beurteilt, eine innere Logik der vorliegenden Textabfolge läßt sich nicht leugnen: *Geburtsankündigung* eines königlichen Sprosses (7,14), *Anordnung über seinen Namen* (9,1-6), *Vorhersage über seine zukünftigen Taten* ⁽²⁹⁾. Wichtig ist, daß der kommende Herrscher nicht aus der Wurzel Davids, sondern aus der Isais erwartet wird, d.h. an der langen Ahnenreihe der früheren Könige Israels vorbei. Der Neubeginn institutionalisierter Herrschaft soll völlig unbelastet von der vergangenen Geschichte des Machtmißbrauchs der Könige von statten gehen. Auch wird dem kommenden Regenten nicht der Titel "König" verliehen, sondern es ist von "Herrschaft" (משרה) die Rede, was als implizite Kritik am Königtum aufgefaßt werden muß. Es wird erwartet, daß der kommende Herrscher nicht nach dem Hörensagen seine Urteile fällt (11,3), sondern daß er die Schwachen (דלים) in Gerechtigkeit richtet und Recht schafft in Geradheit den

⁽²⁷⁾ Jes 11,9; 56,7; 57,13; 65,11.25; 66,20.

⁽²⁸⁾ Dazu u.a. LOHFINK, *Armut in den Gesetzen des Alten Orients und der Bibel*, 239-259.

⁽²⁹⁾ Siehe BERGES, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 119-124.

Elenden des Landes (לעני ארץ). Diese friedensstiftende Herrschaft des Immanuel wird zur paradiesischen Harmonie tödlicher Widersacher führen (11,6-8), die auf dem Zion exemplarische Gestalt annimmt (11,9; 65,25). Die Völker werden ganz von selbst zum Zion strömen, um dort die Tora, die zum friedfertigen Zusammenleben aller führt, in Empfang zu nehmen (2,2-4)⁽³⁰⁾.

Das Motiv einer für die Zukunft gerechten Herrschaft mit positiven Folgen für die Rechtssicherheit der Armen wird nochmals in 32,6-7 angeschnitten, diesmal deutlich weisheitlich gefärbt⁽³¹⁾. Die Königsherrschaft, die allein JHWH zusteht, wird eine Beamten-schaft nach sich ziehen, die in Gerechtigkeit ihre Aufgaben erfüllt. Nicht mehr Ausbeutung und Unterdrückung hat man von ihr zu befürchten, sondern ein jeder der Beamten wird Schutz und Sicherheit bieten. Ganz im Gegenteil dazu stehen die Toren, die Böses planen und auch tun, was sich daran zeigt, daß sie den Hungernden Nahrung und den Dürstenden Trank vorenthalten; zudem verderben sie durch ihre Lügenworte die Elenden (k. עניים), obwohl das Recht auf seiten des Armen liegt (אביון) (32,6b-7). Die Zionsgemeinde, die hinter diesen Worten steht, ist sowohl prophetisch wie auch weisheitlich geprägt und ist zudem in der Lage, die Jesajatradiation kreativ fortzuschreiben. War das Medium Jesajas das gesprochene Wort, das durch seine Schüler festgehalten worden war (8,16-18; 30,8), so ist das Mittel der Zionsgemeinde das prophetische Buch (29,11-12.17-24; 30,18-26). In der von ihr erhofften Zukunft werden auch Taube die Worte ihres Buches hören. Die größten Nutznießer der prophetischen Rolle werden dann die "Ärmsten unter den Menschen" sein (אביוני אדם), so daß diese Elenden (עניים) sich wieder in JHWH freuen können; denn dem Gewaltmenschen und Spötter ist ein Ende bereitet, und die Planer von Bosheit sind vernichtet (29,20). Die Armen sind somit befreit von denen, die beim Rechtsstreit zur Sünde, d.h. zur Rechtsverdrehung, verführen, Fallen stellen und den Gerechten ins Chaos (חור) abdrängen (29,21). Die Hoffnung auf eine künftige

⁽³⁰⁾ E. ZENGER, "Die Verheißung Jesaja 11,1-10: universal oder partikular?", *Studies in the Book of Isaiah*. Festschrift W.A.M. Beuken (Hrsg. J. van RUITEN – M. VERVENNE) (BETL 132; Leuven 1997) 147: "Wenn auf dem Zion die Unterdrückten und Armen endlich zu ihrem Lebensrecht kommen, bricht an diesem Ort der Schöpfung die Gottesherrschaft an. Dieser Ort lohnt dann wirklich, daß die Völker sich dort kundig machen".

⁽³¹⁾ BERGES, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 233-235.

Vernichtung der gewalttätigen Rechtsverdreher zeigt, daß sich der Konflikt innerhalb der nachexilischen Gemeinde zuspitzt. Wenn die Worte der prophetischen Rolle den "Ärmsten unter den Menschen" Trost und Zuspruch sein sollen, dann deutet das darauf hin, daß gerade sie die Adressaten der prophetischen Rolle sind. Die Aufhebung der Verstockung auf der einen bedeutet zugleich die Vernichtung der Frevler auf der anderen Seite⁽³²⁾. Die Freude über die Befreiung, die gemäß den Deuteronomikern gerade in den *gemeinsamen* Festen des ganzen Volkes aufscheinen soll, wird im Jesajabuch deutlich auf diejenigen des Gottesvolkes begrenzt, die aus der Unterdrückung durch Armut und Ausbeutung befreit sind.

Neben dieser israelitischen Innenperspektive gibt es im Jesajabuch auch eine Sichtweise, die die Freude über das Ende von Not und Gewalt auf alle Bedrängten der Erde ausweitert. Dies geschieht innerhalb der sog. Jesaja-Apokalypse (24-27) und zwar zuerst im Lied der aus dem Weltgericht entkommenen Gerechten (25,1-5), die nach dem Untergang Babels als der Weltstadt des Bösen (24,7-13) das Königtum JHWHs auf dem Berg Zion bejubeln (24,23). So wie Gottes Gericht weltweit gilt, so auch der Jubel der Gerechten, unabhängig von ihrer ethnischen Herkunft. War das Mahl JHWHs auf dem Sinai allein Mose, Aaron und den sieben Ältesten aus Israel vorbehalten (Ex 24,9-11), so sind nun auf dem Zion alle Völker geladen (25,6-7), das heißt, alle Gerechten aus Israel *und* den Völkern. In einem Danklied wird Gott gepriesen, daß er Schutz dem Schwachen (מֵאִי לְדָל) und Armen in seiner Not gewesen sei (לְאִבְיִן בְּצָר לֵו) (25,4). Der Untergang der befestigten Stadt (25,2), der mächtige Völker zur Ehrenbezeugung für JHWH anleitet, wird in Jes 26,5b-6 erneut aufgenommen, und zwar in einem Danklied, das den Einzug eines gerechten Volkes [in Jerusalem] feiert. Doch nun reicht es nicht mehr, daß JHWH die Bewohner der Höhe, d.h. die Oberschicht, niederdrückt, sondern die Füße des Elenden (רַגְלֵי עֵי), die Schritte der Schwachen (מֵאִי דְלִים) werden sie zertreten! Dies ist die einzige Stelle im Jesajabuch, an der die Armen nicht als Opfer der Gewalttätigen oder als Empfänger göttlicher Hilfe auftreten, sondern aktiv an der Beseitigung der Unrechtsordnung mitbeteiligt sind⁽³³⁾.

⁽³²⁾ Nach KAISER, *Jesaja 13-39*, 221, zeichnet sich hier eine gesellschaftliche Dreiteilung ab: die demütigen Frommen, die Gewaltmenschen und die noch Umkehrfähigen.

⁽³³⁾ Vgl. K. KOENEN, *Heil den Gerechten – Unheil den Sündern!* Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der Prophetenbücher (BZAW 229; Berlin 1994) 108.

2. Belege in Jes 40–55

Die Belege für Arme sind im zweiten Teil des Jesajabuches zwar nicht häufig, aber doch signifikant. In den sogenannten deuterjesajanischen Kapiteln findet sich als Armenterminologie allein die Wortfamilie ענה II: עָנִי (41,17; 49,13) bzw. das Substantiv עָנִי (48,10)⁽³⁴⁾. Dazu kommt die Bezeichnung Zions als "elende Frau" (עֲנִיָּה) (51,21; 54,11), sowie die des Gottesknechtes als "Vergewaltigter" (מַעֲנֶה), "Gebeugter" (נִעְנֶה) (53,4.7).

In den deuterjesajanischen Belegen geht es nicht um eine Teilmenge Israels, die durch Raub und Unterdrückung in eine schwere Notlage gekommen ist, sondern um das *gemeinsame Schicksal der Gola*. In und durch die babylonische Deportation sind alle Exulanten, ja ganz Israel, zu "Armen" geworden. Die klare Trennung zwischen Unterdrückern und Unterdrückten, die die Armenbelege innerhalb von Jes 1-39 kennzeichnete, ist in Jes 41,17 aufgehoben: "Die Elenden [und Armen] suchen Wasser [aber es gibt keins], ihre Zunge verschmachtet vor Durst. Aber ich, JHWH, erhöre sie, Israels Gott, ich verlasse sie nicht". Mit dieser Heilsankündigung sagt der Prophet den Exilierten JHWHs sicheren Beistand auf dem zukünftigen Rückweg in ihre Heimat zu, was aber nicht allein auf die Wasserversorgung beschränkt ist. Diese Interpretation stützt sich auf das wohl eingefügte וַאֲנִי, das allein auf den Wassermangel abzielt und somit den Zug durch die Wüste — analog zum Exodus aus Ägypten — dramatisiert. Vielleicht hat gerade dieser Zusatz, trotz des Durstes sei kein Wasser vorhanden, anschließend die Einfügung der אֲבִירִים veranlaßt, was keine Spiritualisierung bedeutet, sondern die Zuspitzung auf eine konkrete Mangelsituation⁽³⁵⁾. Der Exilsprophet versteht seine Heilsankündigung in einem umfassenden Sinn: welche Nöte die Exilierten auch immer zu erwarten haben, JHWH wird ihnen allzeit helfend zur Stelle stehen: "Israel soll seinen Gott als Urheber der Rettung erkennen"⁽³⁶⁾.

Die Entscheidung, die nahende Befreiung und den Untergang Babels durch Kyros entweder JHWHs Geschichtsmächtigkeit (44,28;

⁽³⁴⁾ Das אֲבִירִים in 41,17 ist *metri causa* auszuscheiden, was auch dadurch gestützt wird, daß אֲבִירִים sonst überhaupt nicht mehr in Jes 40–66 vorkommt: so K. ELLIGER, *Deuterjesaja*. 1. Teilband Jesaja 40,1–45,7 (BKAT XI/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978) 157, 161.

⁽³⁵⁾ Gegen ELLIGER, *Deuterjesaja*, 161; SCHWANTES, *Recht*, 169.

⁽³⁶⁾ J. VAN OORSCHOT, *Von Babel zum Zion*. Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (BZAW 206; Berlin 1993) 65.

45,1) oder aber den Fremdgöttern zuzurechnen, spitzt sich in Jes 48 zu. Dies ist auch daraus zu ersehen, daß in 48,20 der erste Auszugsbefehl erfolgt. Das Neue, das JHWH nun kundtut (48,6) ist nicht die Berufung des Kyros, der ja schon in 44,28 und 45,1 mit Namen genannt ist, sondern das Heranwachsen des treuen Knechts, d.h. desjenigen Teils der Gola, der im Vertrauen auf die Geschichtsmächtigkeit JHWHs bereit ist, den Rückweg nach Jerusalem anzutreten. In diesem Kontext ist auch Jes 48,10 auszulegen: "Siehe, ich habe dich geläutert, nicht um Silber, ich habe dich erwählt im Ofen des Elends (בַּחֶרֶךְ בְּכֹר עֵי)". Unter deutlichem Rückgriff auf den Ägyptenaufenthalt, der häufiger als "Eisen[schmelz]ofen" bezeichnet ist (כּוּר בַּרְזֶל) (Dtn 4,20; 1 Kön 8,51; Jer 11,4), wird das babylonische Exil als "Ofen des Elends" beschrieben, in dem JHWH "dich erwählt hat". Es ist wichtig, hier am MT festzuhalten und nicht mit 1QJes^a anstelle von "erwählen" (בָּחַר) das naheliegende "prüfen" (בָּחַן) zu lesen. Ein Blick auf die Verwendung von "erwählen" im Zusammenhang mit der Berufung des Ebed (41,8.9; 43,10; 44,1.2) verdeutlicht, worum es in 48,10 geht: nämlich um die Läuterung (צִרְף) und Erwählung des treuen Knechts, d.h. des Teiles der Gola, der während der Elendserfahrung des Exils nicht an JHWH irre geworden ist. Nicht das Elend an sich ist für die Erwählung relevant, sondern die Tatsache, "im Ofen des Elends" weiterhin an JHWH festgehalten zu haben! Darin besteht auch das Neue gegenüber der Noterfahrung in Ägypten; keinem der Israeliten ist es damals wohl eingefallen, freiwillig in Ägypten zu bleiben — dies hat sich bei der babylonischen Gola radikal geändert. Der Auszug aus Babel kann nicht mehr von JHWH allein geleistet werden, sondern ist vom je eigenen Ja der Deportierten zur Rückkehr abhängig. JHWH kann durch den Siegeszug des Kyros und der Einnahme Babels (Jes 47) zwar die politischen Vorbedingungen zur Heimkehr schaffen, aber das Vertrauen in JHWHs Geschichtsmächtigkeit bleibt der Glaubensentscheidung des Einzelnen überlassen. Daß sich der Großteil der Gola gegen eine Rückkehr entschied, ist wegen der später blühenden babylonischen Diaspora als historisch gesichert anzusehen⁽³⁷⁾.

Entgegen den Stellen aus dem ersten Teil des Jesajabuches nennen die "Armenbelege" in Jes 41,17 und 48,10 keine Gegner, es sei denn die eigene Skepsis gegenüber einem Gott, der sein Volk in

(37) Zu Exil und babylonischer Diaspora siehe J.M. SCOTT (Hrsg.), *Exile. Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions* (JSJSS 56; Leiden 1997).

die Verbannung hat ziehen lassen und seinen Tempel nicht hat schützen können. Der Arme ist in deuterijosajanischer Sicht gerade der, der auch und gerade im Exil weiterhin an JHWH und seiner Rettungsmacht festhält⁽³⁸⁾. Daß dieses Vertrauen auf die Verheißung JHWHs nicht allein von denjenigen verlangt ist, die aus Babylon zurückkehren, sondern auch von denen, die in Jerusalem verblieben waren, zeigt Jes 49,13: "Jubelt, ihr Himmel, frohlocke, du Erde, brecht in Jubel aus, ihr Berge, denn JHWH hat sein Volk getröstet (וַיְנַחֵם יְהוָה עַמּוֹ) und sich seiner Elenden erbarmt (וַיִּרְחַם)". Nicht zufällig schließt sich daran unmittelbar (waw consecutivum) der skeptische Einwand Zions, d.h. der Zionsbevölkerung an: "Verlassen hat mich JHWH, der Herr hat mich vergessen!" (49,14). So wie die Masse der Exilierten nicht mehr an eine Zukunft unter der Führung JHWHs glauben konnte oder wollte, so auch nicht die Masse der in Jerusalem Verbliebenen. Alles liegt daran, ob sich die Bevölkerung in Juda und Jerusalem überhaupt noch "trösten" lassen will, worauf der Prolog mit der eingeschobenen skeptischen Frage (40,1.6-8) anspielt. Stehen in Jes 49,14 "seine Elenden" mit "seinem Volk" parallel, dann bedeutet das, daß nur diejenigen zu JHWHs Volk gehören, die sich wie "Arme" ganz dem Trost und dem Erbarmen⁽³⁹⁾ ihres Gottes anvertrauen.

Die Konnotation des "Armen und Elenden" als den, der sich ganz der Hilfe JHWHs anvertraut, ist aus der Psalmensprache der individuellen Klage geläufig⁽⁴⁰⁾. Dieses Element der privaten Frömmigkeit ist in Jes 40–55 auf die politische Situation der Gola und der im Land Verbliebenen übertragen. Daß sich dabei ein starker Zionsbezug zeigt, als Aufruf zur Rückkehr und Restauration, ist nicht verwunderlich, sind doch auch die individuellen Klagen oftmals an den Zion, dem Ort der JHWH-Präsenz gebunden⁽⁴¹⁾.

⁽³⁸⁾ Gegen SCHWANTES, *Recht* 172, der meint, die Exilierung an sich sei das dtjes. Kriterium, um als "arm" zu gelten.

⁽³⁹⁾ רַחֵם ist neben נַחֵם ein Schlüsselwort für den Zion-Restaurationsteil in Jes 49-55: 49,10.13.15; 51,3; 52,9; 54,8.10; 55,7; [60,10].

⁽⁴⁰⁾ J. CREACH, *Yahweh as Refuge and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (JSOTSS 217; Sheffield 1996).

⁽⁴¹⁾ Siehe R. ALBERTZ, *Persönliche Frömmigkeit und offizielle Religion. Religionsinterner Pluralismus in Israel und Babylon* (CThM 9; Stuttgart 1978) 297-298: der Tempel als Ort der JHWH-Präsenz in den individuellen Klagen, u.a. in Ps 3,5; 42,5.7; 43,3; 63,3; als dort vorgetragen, siehe Ps 5; 26; 27; 28; 51.

Wenn in Jes 51,21 und 54,11 Zion selbst als "Elende" (ענייה) angesprochen wird, so ist das die konsequente Weiterführung der "Armen-Thematik" in Jes 40-55: waren dies zuerst die Exilierten insgesamt (41,17), dann allein die zur Rückkehr Bereiten (48,10) mit denjenigen, die in Jerusalem auf die Restauration der Stadt hofften (49,13), so wird nun Zion selbst als Leidensfrau dargestellt, und zwar jeweils in einem Trostwort, das ihr noch anhaltendes Elend dem zukünftigen Heilszustand gegenüberstellt. JHWH nimmt ihr den Becher seines Zornes aus der Hand und gibt diesen nun ihren Peinigern zu trinken, denen, die zu Jerusalem sagten: "Bücke dich, damit wir darübergehen" (51,23). Die Heilsankündigung für die noch in Skepsis gefangenen Exilierten (41,17) ist zu einem Trostwort an die am Boden liegende Frau Zion geworden, die ihren Rücken zum Weg für ihre Peiniger hinhalten mußte⁽⁴²⁾. Dieses Bild der mißhandelten und gequälten Frau Zion ist ohne Zweifel von den Klageliedern beeinflusst, die wie kein anderes biblisches Buch das grausame Schicksal Jerusalems und Zions thematisieren⁽⁴³⁾.

In Jes 54,11 wird das Bild der elenden Frau Zion durch zwei weitere Beschreibungen dramatisiert: sie ist die [vom Sturm] "Geschüttelte" (סערה), "Ungetröstete" (לא נחמה), die JHWH mit kostbarsten Edelsteinen wieder aufbauen will (54,12). Wenn im direkten Anschluß von "deinen Söhnen" als Jünger JHWHs die Rede ist (54,13), deutet das darauf hin, daß mit den zuerst genannten Edelsteinen nicht reale Baumaterialien gemeint sind, sondern die Söhne Zions selbst. Diese Redeweise deckt sich mit der in Klgl 4,1-2, was auf einen gemeinsamen Zeithintergrund hinweist⁽⁴⁴⁾. Dabei zeigt Jes 54 einen Weg aus der tristen Gegenwartsbeschreibung der Klagelieder: Zions edelste Steine, mit denen JHWH ihre Restauration vollzieht, sind seine Lehrlinge (למורי יהודה), denen allumfassendes Heil zukommt.

Wenn zum Schluß von Jes 54 zum ersten Mal das Wort "Knechte" im Plural aufscheint, und zwar als Nutznießer der anbrechenden Heilszeit, dann können damit nur die Kinder Zions, der einst elenden, nun aber von JHWH getrösteten Frau, ja seiner Braut sein! Diese Identifikation der Knechte mit den Söhnen der elenden

⁽⁴²⁾ Die Anspielung auf den gepeinigten Rücken des Gottesknechts (Jes 50,6) ist nicht zu überhören!

⁽⁴³⁾ Dazu U. BERGES, "'Ich bin der Mann, der Elend sah' (Klgl 3,1). Zionstheologie als Weg aus der Krise"; erscheint demnächst in *BZ*.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Vgl. in der weiteren Rezeption: Tob 13,17; Offb 21,18-21.

Frau Zion hat sein Pendant in der Rede von der Nachkommenschaft, die dem Gottesknecht im vierten Ebed-JHWH-Lied verheißen ist (53,10). Dabei ist es nicht unerheblich, daß dieser Leidensmann wie auch die Leidensfrau Zion durch die Wortfamilie ענה II, der auch das Adjektiv "elend" angehört, charakterisiert ist: er ist ein von Gott "Vergewaltigter" (מענה)⁽⁴⁵⁾ (Jes 53,4) und "Gebeugter" (נענה) (53,7), was durch das betonte "Er" (הוא) noch unterstrichen ist. Die zahlreichen Übereinstimmungen zwischen dem Leidensmann und der Leidensfrau lassen keinen anderen Schluß als den zu, daß hier bewußt Beziehungen geschaffen sind, um die Nachkommenschaft des Knechts mit den Kindern der gedemütigten Frau Zion zu identifizieren⁽⁴⁶⁾. Die Abadim, die im letzten Drittel des Buches Jesaja eine so große Rolle spielen⁽⁴⁷⁾, sind als Nachkommenschaft des geschändeten Ebed und der gedemütigten Frau Zion ausgewiesen. Daß diese Herkunft auch sie wesentlich bestimmt, ist zu erwarten und soll im folgenden geprüft werden.

3. Belege in Jes 55–66 (Zef 3,12 und Sach 9,9)

Wie bereits in Jes 40–55 zu beobachten war, sind auch hier die Stellen nicht zahlreich: das Wortfeld "Arme" kommt allein dreimal vor: 58,7 (עניים), 61,1 (עניים) und 66,2 (עני).

Der mittlere Beleg von 61,1 steht im vorliegenden Endtext zwischen den zwei "Licht"-Kapiteln von 60 und 62. Dabei setzt sich die Schicksalsgemeinschaft von Ebed und Zion aus Jes 40–55 fort: "Zion zieht in der Schlußphase des Heils überhaupt Züge des höchsten Amtsträgers Jahwes, wie sie das Deuteriojesabuch bereithielt, auf sich"⁽⁴⁸⁾. Ob das sich vorstellende Ich in 61,1–3 dem Propheten der Restauration oder Zion selbst als Geistträgerin zukommt, die Adressaten der Frohbotschaft sind die Anawim. Ein wichtiger Aspekt der prophetischen Selbstvorstellung ist, daß die Frohbotschaft von Heilung und Befreiung nicht dem nachexilischen Israel in seiner Gesamtheit gilt, sondern allein den Elenden, denen, die von der erhofften Heilszeit (vgl. Jes 60; 62) tief enttäuscht

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Siehe in Kgl 5,11, die Frauen in Zion, die vom Feind vergewaltigt werden (נשים בציון ענו); vgl. auch Gen 34,2; 2 Sam 13,12.14.22.32; Ri 19,24; 20,5.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Dazu die Auflistung bei BERGES, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 405–406.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ "Knechte" in Jes 56,6; 63,17; 65,8.9.13.14.15; 66,14.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ O.H. STECK, "Der Gottesknecht als 'Bund' und 'Licht'. Beobachtungen im Zweiten Jesaja", *ZTK* 90 (1993) 117–134 (127).

sind⁽⁴⁹⁾ und die anscheinend erneut in die Schuldklaverei abgesunken sind, was der Ausdruck דָּרֹר mit Blick auf Lev 25,10 nahelegt. Der nachexilische Prophet des Wiederaufbaus vergleicht die wirtschaftlich Verelendeten seiner Zeit mit den zuvor in Babel Gefesselten (42,7; 49,9)⁽⁵⁰⁾. Wie JHWH einst den Babyloniern ihre Gefangenen (שָׁבִי) entreißen konnte (49,24-25), so jetzt die Schuldklaven ihren geldgierigen Ausbeutern⁽⁵¹⁾.

Mit den Anawim sind in 61,1-2 nicht nur "Demütige" gemeint⁽⁵²⁾, sondern in besonderem Maße wirtschaftliche Randexistenzen, denen die Restauration Jerusalems und Judas in persischer Zeit nur weitere Verarmung brachte. In bewußtem Kontrast zu ihrer aktuellen Lage werden diese Elenden, denen Befreiung verkündet ist, "Eichen der Gerechtigkeit" und "Pflanzung JHWHs zur Verherrlichung" genannt. In diesen Ehrenbezeichnungen kommt deutlich ein gruppenspezifischer Charakter zum Vorschein, der sich dann in den "Knechten" von Jes 65-66 konkretisiert.

Die skandalöse Pauperisierung eines Großteils des nachexilischen Israels ist u.a. Anlaß zur sozialen Reform unter Nehemia gewesen, von der Neh 5 berichtet. Doch auch im tritojesajanischen Kontext gibt es einen deutlichen Hinweis auf die prekäre Lage derer, denen in besonderem Maße die Frohbotschaft gilt. Dieser findet sich im Diskussionswort von 58,3-13, wo es um die Frage geht, warum die Heilszeit noch aussteht, wo doch so viel gefastet (צָוֹם) werde, wobei auch Selbstkasteiungen nicht fehlten (58,3). Es ist zu beachten, wie hier wie in sonst keinem anderen biblischen Text mit der hebräischen Wurzel עָנָה kreativ umgegangen wird. Nicht das rituelle Fasten wird in der prophetischen Antwort

⁽⁴⁹⁾ In 61,3a werden sie auch "Trauernde Zions" genannt, was als erklärender Zusatz zu werten ist.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ W.A.M. BEUKEN, "Servant and Herald of Good Tidings. Isaiah 61 as an Interpretation of Isaiah 40-55", *The Book of Isaiah* (Hrsg. J. VERMEYLEN) (BETL 81; Leuven 1989) 429.

⁽⁵¹⁾ STECK, *Bund*, 128; anders S. VIRGULIN, "Gli 'Anawim in Is. 61,1'", *Evangelizare pauperibus*, 234-236; R. ALBERTZ, "Die 'Antrittspredigt' Jesu im Lukasevangelium auf ihrem alttestamentlichen Hintergrund", *ZNW* 74 (1983) 182-206.

⁽⁵²⁾ K. KOENEN, *Ethik und Eschatologie im Tritojesajabuch*. Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie (WMANT 62; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1990) 109: "Tritojesaja spricht sich für die Befreiung der Schuldklaven und für das Ende aller Unterdrückung aus. Der Unterschicht gilt seine Heilsbotschaft in besonderem Maße".

abgelehnt, sondern eine Selbstkasteiung (ענינו נפשנו), die an den Nöten der Elenden vorbeigeht. Das eigene Ich zu erniedrigen (58,5) ist nur dann sinnvoll, wenn es dazu dient, die gedemütigte Persönlichkeit (נפש נעדה) (58,10) der Armen (עניים) zu sättigen, ihnen Nahrung, Kleidung, Unterkunft, ja das eigene Selbst anzubieten. Hier geht es nicht mehr um den Auszug aus Babel, sondern um einen Exodus aus den ureigensten Egoismen, die durch religiöse Leistungen nicht nur vermindert, sondern u.U. noch gesteigert werden⁽⁵³⁾. Allein unter der Bedingung, daß die Sorge für die Armen im Mittelpunkt der Gottsuche steht, wird JHWH dem antworten (יודה יענה) (58,9), der zu ihm ruft⁽⁵⁴⁾.

Der Kritik an rituellen Übungen wie Fastenversammlungen und Selbstkasteiungen (Jes 58), bei denen vor lauter Eigensorge der bedürftige Mitmensch gar nicht in den Blick kommt, steht in 66,1-4 eine Relativierung des Tempelkultes zur Seite. In einem prophetischen Kultbescheid bringt JHWH seine Verwunderung darüber zum Ausdruck, was denn ein von Menschenhand gemachter Tempel solle, da ihm doch alles gehöre; seine unermessliche Größe lasse sich nicht durch ein irdisches Gebäude eingrenzen. Eine völlige Ablehnung des Tempels liegt hier wohl kaum vor, da das den biblischen Traditionen widerspräche und einer aufklärerischen Kultkritik zugunsten des religiösen Individuums gleichkäme⁽⁵⁵⁾. Wie im Falle der Fastenfrage geht es auch hier nicht um die Ablehnung gottesdienstlicher Praktiken, sondern um die persönliche Disposition derer, die am rituell-kultischen Leben des nachexilischen Israel teilnehmen. So wie ein ritualisiertes Fasten, das die soziale Verantwortung gegenüber den wirtschaftlich Schwachen nicht wahrnimmt, vom Gott Israels abgelehnt wird, so auch ein Tempel, der vor lauter Eigendynamik den Respekt vor JHWHs Wort vergessen läßt. Diese Tempelkritik richtet sich gegen ein gesellschaftliches Klima, bei dem nur der hochgeachtet ist, der

⁽⁵³⁾ R. LACK, *La symbolique du livre d'Isaïe*. Essai sur l'image littéraire comme élément de structuration (AnBib 59; Rom 1973) 135: "Le jeûne, qui devrait susciter en l'homme toutes les aspirations dont la faim est le symbole, ne fait que le renfermer sur lui-même".

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Die Verbindung von Fastenfrage und sozialem Engagement für die Armen begegnet ebenfalls in Sach 7 (עני in Sach 7,10).

⁽⁵⁵⁾ So KOENEN, *Ethik*, 187: "Jahwe will nicht die Reinheit, sondern das Ende des Tempelkultes. Er legt auf den Bau des Tempels keinen Wert, sondern nur auf die demütige Ehrfurcht vor seinem Wort".

finanziell Erhebliches zum Aufbau des Gotteshauses beitragen kann⁽⁵⁶⁾. Darauf antwortet der prophetische Bescheid: Erstens ist der Tempel gar nicht so wichtig, wie die großen Bauherren meinen, und zweitens schaut Gott auf den Armen (עני). Wie in 61,1 steht der Begriff "Armer" auch hier am Beginn einer Reihe von Identitätsmerkmalen: so ist der עני näher definiert als einer der "zerschlagenen Geistes" (נכה רוח)⁽⁵⁷⁾ ist, was an die Hilfe für die "zerbrochenen Herzen" (נשברי לב) (61,1) erinnert. Die Aussage des in der Höhe thronenden Gottes, der auf die Zerschlagenen helfend zukommt⁽⁵⁸⁾, findet sich auch in 57,15, wobei die Begriffe "zerschlagen" und "heilen" (57,18) auf das Schicksal des Gottesknechtes verweisen (53,5.10)⁽⁵⁹⁾. Hier zeigt sich, daß die Gruppe der Armen, denen JHWHs Hilfe gilt, in der Nachfolge des Ebed steht. Daß es sich um eine von der Masse abgesonderte Gruppe von JHWH-Anhängern handelt, zeigt ihre Charakterisierung als die, die vor dem Wort JHWHs zittern (66,2.5)⁽⁶⁰⁾. Diese Gruppe steht in scharfem Kontrast zu den "Brüdern, die euch hassen" (66,5), wohl zu denen, die im Tempel und in der rituellen Observanz ihre Sicherheit zu finden glaubten (vgl. Jer 7,5). Doch gerade vom Ort der vermeintlichen Sicherheit wird JHWH die Vergeltung wie einen gewaltigen Sturm losbrechen lassen (66,6). Wer die vor dem Wort Gottes Zitternden, die zerschlagenen Geistes sind, das wird zum Schluß des Jesajabuches in aller Deutlichkeit gesagt: es sind JHWHs Knechte (66,14), die Söhne Mutter Zions (66,8), der einst so gedemütigten Frau! So stehen am Ende des Jesajabuches die

(⁵⁶) Daß es hierbei nicht um den eigentlichen Wiederaufbau des Tempels gehen kann (520-515 v. Chr.), zeigen die Mißstände, die einen voll funktionstüchtigen Opferbetrieb geradezu voraussetzen.

(⁵⁷) Beachte das Wortspiel mit נכה: JHWH schaut auf den, der zerschlagenen Geistes ist, aber nicht auf den, der Menschen erschlägt (מכה איש) (66,3; vgl. 58,4).

(⁵⁸) Jüngst B. EGO, "Der Herr blickt herab von der Höhe seines Heiligtums". Zur Vorstellung von Gottes himmlischem Thronen in exilisch-nachexilischer Zeit", ZAW 110 (1998) 566: "Gottes Zuwendung gilt - unabhängig von jedem Tempelgebäude - den Bedrückten und Zerschlagenen, indem er diesen - wie im Heiligtum - einwohnt und gegenwärtig ist".

(⁵⁹) W.A.M. BEUKEN, "Trito-Jesaja: profetie en schriftgeleerdheid", *Profeten en profetische geschriften* (Hrsg. F. GARCIA MARTÍNEZ) (Kampen 1987) 80.

(⁶⁰) Nur noch in Esr 9,4; 10,3; die "Quäker" haben von dieser Stelle her ihren Namen.

Knechte als Nachkommen des Ebed und Kinder Zions; sie bilden die arme, vor dem Gotteswort zitternde Gemeinde, die Wohnrecht auf dem Zion genießt⁽⁶¹⁾.

Die Erfahrung des Exils hat demnach nicht Israel insgesamt verändert, sondern nur eine Gruppe, die ihren Ursprung in der Gola-Gemeinde hatte. Es wird eine eschatologische Scheidung und Entscheidung erwartet, in der Gott seine Macht zugunsten der Knechte, aber gegen ihre Gegner offenbart (66,14). Deren Herausforderung, JHWH möge sich doch zeigen, damit auch sie sich freuen könnten (66,5), wird sich zu ihrer Vernichtung erfüllen!

Wie keine andere Belegstelle der Armenterminologie bringt Zef 3,12 das Resultat dieser eschatologischen Scheidung auf den Punkt: Daß Zef 3,12 nicht dem Propheten Zefanja zur Zeit der jorschijanschen Reform zugerechnet werden kann, zeigt u.a. die wörtliche Übereinstimmung von Zef 3,12b mit Jes 14,32: "Ja, sie weiden und lagern sich, und keiner wird sie aufschrecken". Beide stammen aus der gleichen nachexilischen Zeit (Mitte 5. Jh.), in der sich eine gruppenspezifische Mentalität herauszubilden beginnt. Entgegen der vorexilischen Konzeption, wonach man durch den Mißbrauch der Reichen "arm" gemacht wurde, liegt es nun an einem selbst, ob man zum armen und bedürftigen Restvolk auf dem Zion gehören will. Die Bedingungen dafür sind in Zef 2,3 in aller Deutlichkeit genannt: "Sucht JHWH, alle Elenden des Landes (כל-עוני הארץ), die sein Recht tun, sucht Gerechtigkeit (צדק), sucht Demut (ענוה), vielleicht könnt ihr euch verbergen am Tag des Zornes JHWHs". Diese eindringliche Aufforderung an die Anawim steht im gesamten AT einzig da. Der Imperativ, JHWH zu suchen, richtet sich an diejenigen, die um das Gottesrecht wissen (im Gegensatz zu Jer 5,4!) und es in Demut praktizieren. Dem "Vielleicht" der Rettung steht in Zef 3,12-13 die Sicherheit des übrig gelassenen Restes gegenüber. Die eschatologische Scheidung und Entscheidung macht sich gerade am Thema der "Armen" fest!

In diesem Zusammenhang ist auch das Motiv des messianischen Herrschers als Garant einer gerechten, den Armen schützenden Ordnung zu verstehen (Jes 9,1-6; 11,1-9). Auch hier ist ein Durchbruch zur Armentheologie zu beobachten: nicht nur wird der messianische Herrscher für die Elenden eintreten, sondern er selbst

⁽⁶¹⁾ Dazu bes. die Trennung der Gemeinde in Jes 65; siehe BERGES, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 497-509.

wird arm sein. So wird in Sach 9,9 die Tochter Zion zum Jubel aufgefordert, weil ihr König [als Bräutigam] zu ihr kommt; "gerecht und errettet, er selbst ist arm" (צדיק ונושע הוא עני). Die Aussage, der messianische König sei ein [von Gott] Geretteter, war der LXX unverständlich bzw. unerträglich und so las sie σωζων, ein Rettender, was die Vg mit *salvator* übersetzt⁽⁶²⁾. Entgegen der gewöhnlichen Vorstellung ist hier nicht davon die Rede, daß dieser König gerecht sei, weil er Recht und Gerechtigkeit etabliert (Jes 11,4; Jer 23,5; Ps 72,2.4.12-14), sondern weil er gegenüber seinen Gegnern im Recht ist; deshalb ist er von Gott "gerettet" worden⁽⁶³⁾. Die Armut des kommenden Messias läßt sich nicht nur auf seine Demut vor Gott einschränken, sondern schließt seine Mittellosigkeit ein. Diese wiederum steht im Zusammenhang von Amt und Auftrag⁽⁶⁴⁾: er kann auf einem Eselfüllen reiten, weil JHWH (MT) die Streitwagen aus Ephraim und die [Kriegs]-rosse aus Jerusalem entfernt (Sach 9,10a); nur so kann es zum Weltfrieden kommen (v 10b).

III. Ergebnisse

Der Gang durch die Armenbelege des Buches Jesaja und des übrigen *corpus propheticum* hat gezeigt, daß sich gerade dieses Buch mit den Armen in besonderer Weise auseinandersetzt; die große Bandbreite an Vorstellungen über die Armen ist nicht zuletzt auf seine lange Entstehungsgeschichte zurückzuführen. Aus dem sozialschwachen, aber noch unabhängigen Kleinbauern (vgl. Amos), der tagtäglich gegen das Abgleiten in Unfreiheit und Lohnarbeit ankämpfen muß, wird in der Verkündigung des Buches Jesaja ein Günstling JHWHs. Aus den Armen als Teil "meines Volkes" (10,2) werden die Armen, "mein Volk" (3,14-15)! Diese Armen werden in

⁽⁶²⁾ Zu den modernen textkritischen Versuchen, der Vorstellung eines armen messianischen Königs zu entkommen, siehe SCHWANTES, *Recht*, 194-195; zur Thematik siehe W.H. SCHMIDT, "Die Ohnmacht des Messias. Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der messianischen Weissagungen im Alten Testament", *KuD* 15 (1969) 18-34; K.D. SCHUNCK, "Die Attribute des eschatologischen Messias. Strukturlinien in der Ausprägung des alttestamentlichen Messiasbildes", *TLZ* 111 (1986) 642-652.

⁽⁶³⁾ SCHWANTES, *Recht*, 195: "Der Messias war einst ein 'Retter' (Jer 23,6, vgl. Ps 72,4.13), ist aber jetzt selber ein 'Geretteter' Gottes".

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Gegen Graf REVENTLOW, *Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi*, 95: "ani heißt hier nicht 'arm', jedenfalls nicht in wirtschaftlichem Sinne, sondern als Geisteshaltung: 'demütig'".

den eschatologischen Einschreibungen an den Zion gebracht; dort finden sie Ruhe und Sicherheit (14,30.32; vgl. 29,17-24; 32,6b-7). Hier finden sich große Übereinstimmungen mit den nachexilischen Texten, die von der Bedürftigkeit des eschatologischen Gottesvolkes (Zef 3,12-13) und von der Armut des messianischen Herrschers selbst handeln (Sach 9,9).

Einmalig ist die Aussage in den proto-apokalyptischen Texten des Jesajabuches, wo die Armen nicht mehr Opfer oder nur passive Nutznießer göttlicher Hilfe sind, sondern aktiv an der Vergeltung gegenüber ihren Unterdrückern teilhaben. Welche sozialen Spannungen müssen sich hinter einer Zukunftshoffnung verbergen, in der die Füße der Geringen und Armen ihre Ausbeuter zertreten (26,5b-6)! Dieser "theologische Aufschrei" weist auf eine sich immer mehr zuspitzende Lage der Armen gegen Ende der persischen bzw. zu Beginn der hellenistischen Zeit hin (vgl. Ijob 24).

Ein Entwicklungsschub, der nicht allein auf eine literarische Fortschreibungstätigkeit, sondern auf ein konkretes geschichtliches Faktum zurückzuführen ist, ist die Identifikation der babylonischen Gola als arm. Wie die Exodusgruppe unter Mose, so ist nun auch Israel in exilischer Zeit völlig von der Führung ihres Gottes abhängig. Wie der Arme in der Gebets- und Klagetradition Israels von seinem persönlichen Schutzgott Heil und Rettung erhoffte, so auch die Exilsgemeinde. Aus dem blinden und tauben Knecht erwächst im "Ofen des Elends" (48,10) JHWHs Knecht, d.h. die heimkehrwillige Gola. Aus ihr, die eine Aufgabe an der skeptischen Bevölkerung Jerusalems zu erfüllen hat, entsteht in der nachexilischen Folgezeit die Gemeinde der Knechte. Diese verstehen sich als die Nachkommenschaft des geschundenen Ebed und der gedemütigten Frau Zion (51,21; 54,11). Zugleich wissen sie sich als Nachfolger der davidischen Dynastie. Sie genießen Wohnrecht auf dem Zion, ihr König ist JHWH allein! Die Besonderheit der Armentheologie des Buches Jesaja liegt somit u.a. in ihrem gruppenspezifischen Charakter. Dieser kommt zum einen in den nachexilischen Einschreibungen innerhalb des ersten Großteils des Buches zum Ausdruck und zum anderen in der Thematik der Knechte als geistige Erben des Ebed und als die wahren Kinder der Mutter Zion. Darüber hinaus zeichnet sich das Buch Jesaja innerhalb des *corpus propheticum* durch die stetig wachsende Verknüpfung von Armen- und Zionstheologie aus. Dabei spielt die Metaphorisierung von Zion als Schutzraum der Armen und Mutter der Knechte aus

Israel *und* den Völkern eine tragende Rolle, wobei dem nach-exilischen Tempelkult mit Skepsis begegnet wird. Stellt man sich die Frage, wo sonst noch innerhalb der alttestamentlichen Schriften eine ähnliche Konstellation der Motivkreise von *Armen*, *Zion* und *Knechte* anzutreffen ist, wird man allein im Psalter fündig⁽⁶⁵⁾.

Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen
Faculteit der Theologie
Postbus 9103
6500 HD Nijmegen, Netherlands

Ulrich BERGES

SUMMARY

In the book of Isaiah, as opposed to other prophets, the topic of the poor is especially important. The socially speaking needy but independent small landholder (Amos) becomes a privileged favourite of YHWH in the message of Isaiah. In the eschatological registrations the poor are taken to Zion. During the Babylonian exile, in the "furnace of distress" (Isa 48,10) arises the servant of YHWH, i.e. the Gola willing to return to their country. In the last part of the book the servants, descendants of the oppressed Ebed and the humiliated woman Zion emerge from the Gola. The constellation of different motifs concerning the *poor*, *Zion* and the *servants* gives the book of Isaiah in its final redaction quite a special appearance.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Auf diese Frage ging der zweite Teil meiner Antrittsvorlesung ein; diesen hoffe ich auch bald in deutscher Sprache und erheblich überarbeitet vorlegen zu können.

Between Tradition and Literary Art* **The Miracle Tradition in the Fourth Gospel**

This paper is about the reception of the miracle tradition from a literary and compositional point of view. I have argued for the use of different literary techniques in the taking up miracle traditions by the Fourth Evangelist⁽¹⁾. In using these traditions, the narrator creates different literary situations that serve different aims in the narrative whole. Sometimes, these new scenes are based on the formal structure of his tradition, but in the act of preserving this structure the author integrates the material into another narrative world. This literary creativity is in the service of a consistent hermeneutical strategy. By hearing or reading the narrative the reader is brought into contact with the narrated Jesus and with the life that he will bring according to his Father's will. In the light of this meeting the reader is asked to believe in Jesus in order to get eternal life.

In this essay, I take up earlier observations made on the topic of the narration of the miracle stories in this gospel and combine them with my own observations to create a picture of the creativity of the Fourth Evangelist in using his tradition.

(*) *In honour of Prof. Dr. Eduard Lohse, Landesbischof i.R., on the occasion of his 75th birthday, with gratitude.*

Paper read at the 15th International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Université de Lausanne, Switzerland, July 1997. A German version of this paper was read at the "Neutestamentliche Sozietät" of Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität, Mainz, Germany, January 1998. I am grateful for all the critical remarks and questions, especially for the helpful remarks of Prof. Dr. J. Beutler, Rome, Prof. Dr. J. Painter, Melbourne, Prof. Dr. U. Schnelle, Halle, and Dr. I. Dunderberg, Helsinki. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. J.C. O'Neill, Edinburgh, for being so kind as to correct the English of my article and for making some further suggestions.

(¹) For the analysis of the miracle tradition from a form-historical point of view cf. M. LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender* (BZNW 98; Berlin – New York 1999) *passim*.

I. Macrostructural Observations

1. *Miracle and conflict*

The portrait of the revealer in conflict with the world and its leadership is an important aspect of the literary and theological strategy of the narrative of the Fourth Gospel⁽²⁾. This corresponds to the programmatic words of the Logos hymn: "This (sc. the light that shines in the darkness [cf. John 1,5] and that the Baptist reports of [cf. John 1,8]) was the true light, that illuminates each person by coming into the cosmos. He was in the cosmos, and the cosmos was created through him (sc. the Logos [cf. v. 3], which is the true light), but the cosmos did not recognise him. He came into his own domain, but his own people did not accept him" (John 1,9-11).

The performance of the miracles plays an important narrative role in this growing conflict in the narrated world of the gospel⁽³⁾. This conflict is a fundamental aspect of the literary formation of the miracle tradition in the Fourth Gospel. The Sabbath conflict stories (John 5,2-18 and 9,1-41) as well as the self-revelation of Jesus as God's gift of life to the world (John 6) lead to refusal and conflict. In John 6, this conflict is finally heightened into conflict between the followers of Jesus (John 6,66-71). It is possible that John 6,60-71 mirrors earlier or present controversies about christology within the Johannine community or between the Johannine community and opponents from the outside⁽⁴⁾. On the narrative level there is more strikingly a pastoral perspective appealing to the reader of the Gospel to believe like Peter (John 6,68)⁽⁵⁾. Peter gives the correct and

(2) Cf. also J. ZUMSTEIN, "Das Johannesevangelium: Eine Strategie des Glaubens", *Theologische Beiträge* 28 (1997) 350-363, esp. 352. Zumstein understands the conflict between belief and unbelief as the core of the Johannine narrative.

(3) On the increasingly intensified conflict arising from the performance of the miracles cf. also W.J. BITTNER, *Jesu Zeichen im Johannesevangelium* (WUNT II/26; Tübingen 1987) 120; D.M. SMITH, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge 1995) 110.

(4) Cf., e.g., L. SCHENKE, "Das johanneische Schisma und die 'Zwölf' (Johannes 6,60-71)", *NTS* 38 (1992) 105-121; Eng. trans.: "The Johannine Schism and the 'Twelve' (John 6:60-71)", *Critical Readings of John 6* (ed. R.A. CULPEPPER) (Biblical Interpretation Series 22; Leiden - New York - Köln 1997) 205-219.

(5) Cf. LABAHN, *Jesus*, 302.

exemplary answer to the question of Jesus in 6,5 with which the implied reader should agree.

This conflict connects the first part of the gospel with the passion and the resurrection narrative. 'The Jews', some of them or their religious leaders who are identified with the unbelieving world and who are stigmatized as the opponents of God's will, seek to kill Jesus (in connection with the miracles cf. 5,18; 11,47-53). Therefore, this conflict belongs for the Fourth Evangelist so deeply to the nature of the revelation of the Son of God that finally the last miracle, the raising of Lazarus, leads to the formal decision to kill the revealer (11,47-53). The legal decision to kill Jesus underlines the connection between the miracles and the passion and resurrection of Jesus⁽⁶⁾. On one hand, this decision is based on all the miracles of Jesus: συνήγαγον οὖν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συνέδριον καὶ ἔλεγον, Τί ποιούμεν ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος πολλὰ ποιεῖ σημεῖα (11,47). So this decision binds up all seven miracle stories as the revelation from which emerges a thorough conflict between the revealer and the world. On the other hand, the narrative flow connects this decision directly with the raising of Lazarus: the report of 'some of the Jews' (11,46) to the Pharisees gives reason for the gathering of the Sanhedrin (11,47). In the light of John 12,9-11, the significance of the last miracle for the decision to kill Jesus is evident. Although all the miracles (except John 2,1-11⁽⁷⁾; 4,46-54) performed by Jesus lead to conflict between the revealer and the world, the last miracle, the raising of Lazarus by Jesus, is the most important reason for killing Jesus and therefore is the immediate cause of the passion and resurrection of Jesus. On the other hand, the raising of Lazarus is an anticipation of the resurrection of Jesus (cf. the parallels between both accounts: the pictures of both tombs, that of Lazarus and that of Jesus, are significantly similar)⁽⁸⁾. With

⁽⁶⁾ J. WAGNER, *Auferstehung und Leben* (BU 19; Regensburg 1988) 12, 410. Cf. D.A. LEE, *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel* (JSNTSS 95; Sheffield 1995) 189: "It (the story of the raising of Lazarus) is the central, pivotal scene of the gospel, holding together narrative structure and theological meaning". See also B. WITHERINGTON, III, *John's Wisdom* (Louisville 1995) 198. For G. MLAKUZHIL, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel* (AnBib 117; Rome 1987) 181-183, 239 (Outline of the Fourth Gospel) John 11,1-12,50 forms a "bridge-section".

⁽⁷⁾ But cf. John 2,13-22 and 2,23-25; see below I.2.B.

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. the reference to the bindings and especially the cloth to wipe away the perspiration (σουδάριον, a Latin loan-word which, apart from John 11,44

the mention of Thomas in 11,16 and in the resurrection chapter, John 20⁽⁹⁾, we find another signal for this line of connection that leads from chapter 11 to 20,24-29⁽¹⁰⁾. Therefore, the last miracle does not only initiate the trial and death of Jesus, but also indicates that the encounter with Jewish and Roman power will fail in the presence of the mighty revealer who is the true life (cf. John 1,4; 5,26; 11,25).

Although it should not be disputed that historical reminiscences of his communities form the background of the stories used by the Fourth Evangelist in John 5 and 9⁽¹¹⁾, the miracle stories are interpreted in the light of a more fundamental and theological principle by the evangelist. The miracle stories in chapters 5–11 recognise that the work and the message of the revealer are scandalous; they cause offence to the world and even to the circle of the disciples (John 6,61). The reader is asked for a decision in the light of the Johannine characters taking part in these conflict stories (cf. e.g. John 6,67-69; 9,35-41; 11,25-27; see also 5,12-14: the cured man missed the christological point of the sign and did not confess Jesus as his saviour). The reader should believe in the revealer sent by God and in him as the giver of life as it is shown by his mighty deeds.

2. *The relationship of the miracle tradition to different genres of text*

Once we accept that the Fourth Evangelist uses traditions for narrating his miracles, the question arises as to the relationship

and 20,7, appears in the NT only in the Lukan writings: Luke 19,20; Acts 19,12); cf. LEE, *Symbolic Narratives*, 214-215; M. LANG, 'Mein Herr und mein Gott' (Joh 20,28) (Diss. masch. Halle/Saale; 1997) 233; F.J. MOLONEY, *Glory Not Dishonor*. Reading John 13–21 (Minneapolis 1998) 161.

⁽⁹⁾ On the role of Thomas in the Gospel of John cf. now I. DUNDERBERG, "John and Thomas in Conflict?", *The Nag Hammadi Library After Fifty Years* (ed. J.D. TURNER – A. MCGUIRE) (NHMS 44; Leiden – New York – Köln 1997) 361-380.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Cf. also O. SCHWANKL, *Licht und Finsternis* (HBS 5; Freiburg – Basel – Wien – Barcelona – Rom – New York 1995) 236; F.J. MOLONEY, *Signs and Shadows*. Reading John 5–12 (Minneapolis 1996) 172.

⁽¹¹⁾ For this basic insight I am indebted to the classical investigation of J.L. MARTYN, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (New York – Evanston 1979). However, some questions need to be raised concerning his reconstruction of the conflict between Synagoge and Johannine Christians; cf. M. LABAHN, "Eine Spurensuche anhand von Joh 5.1–18", *NTS* 44 (1998) 159-179, esp. 174-176.

between his sources, their christology and the theological conception of the gospel author. Although a broad stream of New Testament scholars reads the miracle stories as an integral part of the Fourth Gospel there is still some discussion as to whether they are a positive part of the theological construction of the Fourth Evangelist or a foreign element in the gospel.

Rudolf Bultmann plays down the theological significance of the Johannine miracles, regarding the resurrection narratives together with the miracles as a concession to human weakness⁽¹²⁾. Jürgen Becker in his famous article "Wunder und Christologie" maintains that the Fourth Evangelist has worked the miracle stories of his source into his narrative in such a way as to undercut their original intention. Not only does Becker suggest that the Fourth Evangelist meant to belittle the importance of the miracles he reports, but he fails to see the positive importance the Fourth Evangelist attaches to the signs⁽¹³⁾. He argues that the christology of the evangelist is opposed to the christological aims of his miracle source:

⁽¹²⁾ R. BULTMANN, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (UTB 630; Tübingen 1984) 409. J. PAINTER, "Inclined to God: The Quest for Eternal Life – Bultmannian Hermeneutics and the Theology of the Fourth Gospels", *Exploring the Gospel of John*. In Honor of D. Moody Smith (ed. by R.A. CULPEPPER – C.C. BLACK) (Louisville 1996) 346-368, esp. 347, 348-350, counters the view that Bultmann's interpretation of the Johannine signs is predominantly negative; for such an interpretation of Bultmann's analysis cf., e.g., E. KÄSEMANN, *Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17* (Tübingen 1971) 51. For the discussion between Bultmann and Käsemann in this regard cf. M.J.J. MENKEN, "The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: A Survey of Recent Research", *From Jesus to John*. Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge (ed. by M.C. DE BOER) (JSNTSS 84; Sheffield 1993) 292-320, esp. 314-315, 319-320.

⁽¹³⁾ Cf. also, e.g., H.-C. KAMMLER, "Die 'Zeichen' des Auferstandenen", O. HOFIUS – H.-C. KAMMLER, *Johannesstudien* (WUNT 88; Tübingen 1996) 191-211. Based on the interpretation of miracles as σημεῖον by the Fourth Evangelist ZUMSTEIN, *Johannesevangelium*, 360, assumes that the real meaning of the miracles cannot be found in themselves but belongs to a deeper dimension of the miracles, which is that the miracle worker is the Son of God. The discourses in John 5; 6; 9 and 11 certainly direct attention to this deeper meaning and, therefore, I think, interpret the literary significance of the signs as part of the narration. Nevertheless, I wonder whether it is possible to distinguish between the signs in John and a deeper meaning that is separated from their narration. The miracle itself is open to both meanings: to be interpreted as a pure miracle and to be understood as a sign that is performed by the Son of God who is himself God's gift of life. This openness of the

“In unübersehbarer Korrektur an der Semeiaquelle hat der Evangelist weiter das Thema urchristlicher Verkündigung schlechthin zu Gehör gebracht, nämlich die Verkündigung von Kreuz und Auferstehung. ... War die Epiphanienchristologie des θεῖος ἀνὴρ schon nahezu austauschbar mit anderen Gestalten dieser Provenienz und war dadurch aus der Geschichte beinahe schon Mythos geworden, so lenkt der Evangelist energisch ins Zentrum christlicher Verkündigung und damit zugleich zur Geschichte zurück”⁽¹⁴⁾.

Becker assumes that the Fourth Evangelist accomplishes this christological and theological critique by a literary technique. The stress is not laid on the miracle stories but on the revelatory discourses that often follow the narration of the miracle:

“Dazu gesellt sich eine weitere Beobachtung: Es ist bekannt, daß die Wunder für den Evangelisten häufig nur noch den szenischen Rahmen für die Reden abgeben, die ihrerseits sich dann auch oft von der Situation der Wundererzählungen lösen. Vor allem Joh. v und vi machen deutlich, wie dadurch der Schwerpunkt der Aussage vom Wunder auf die Offenbarungsrede verlagert wird. Das Selbstzeugnis des Gesandten Gottes als Krisis der Welt kritisiert die ‘naive’ Epiphanie”⁽¹⁵⁾.

Therefore, we have to ask where the Johannine miracle stories stand in literary connection with different text genres. Do they receive an interpretation and perhaps a restriction on their theological importance through their contexts?

A. The relationship between the Miracle Stories and the Discourses

The miracle stories in John 5, 6, 9 and 11 as well as in 21⁽¹⁶⁾,

miracle stories will take the reader into a decision between both possible interpretations of the miracles. The implied reader should understand the deeper christological meaning and decide to believe.

For a positive interpretation of the role of miracle narratives for believing in Christ cf., e.g., U. SCHNELLE, *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis 1992).

⁽¹⁴⁾ J. BECKER, “Wunder und Christologie”, *NTS* 16 (1969/70) 130-148, esp. 144. See also N. WALTER, “Die Auslegung überlieferter Wundererzählungen im Johannes-Evangelium”, *Theologische Versuche* 2 (1970) 93-107, esp. 94.

⁽¹⁵⁾ BECKER, *Wunder und Christologie*, 144-145; see also 147.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Concerning the relation between miracle and speech in John 21 cf., e.g., C.K. BARRETT, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London ²1978) 583.

are followed by dialogue texts and sporadically also by revelatory monologues⁽¹⁷⁾. Therefore, it was assumed that the miracle stories provided the basis for the speeches of the revealer.

R. Alan Culpepper directs our attention to the different relationship between narrative and discourse. He speaks of a "progressive conjunction between sign and discourse material"⁽¹⁸⁾.

"The first and the second signs (2:1-11 and 4:46-54) are about the length of synoptic miracle stories and not greatly dissimilar from them. The next three miracle stories (5:2-9; 6:2-21; 9:1-7) each have extended discourses attached to them (5:10-16, 17-47; 6:22-65; and 9:8-41). ... With the last sign, the raising of Lazarus, the progressive conjunction of sign and discourse reaches its zenith: the two cannot be separated successfully"⁽¹⁹⁾.

One could well agree with the literary observations. Nevertheless, the observations of Culpepper show that the formal sequence of miracle stories and discourse texts does not follow a rigid scheme. Both Sabbath conflict stories (chaps. 5 and 9) stand close to each other; however, the maintenance of a strict formal sequence requires that the shepherd discourse (10,1-18) be a monologue concluding the healing of the man born blind (John 9)⁽²⁰⁾; this monologue then forms a formal parallel to both monological

However, L. HARTMAN, "An Attempt at a Text-Centered Exegesis of John 21", *StTh* 38 (1984) 35-36, notes the much looser relationship between the miraculous draught of fish and the following dialogue. Hartman points out some "isotopies" in John 21 (*Attempt* 33) but they do not form such a close semantic connection as the one that we find in John 6.

⁽¹⁷⁾ A somehow similar structure is found in other Johannine passages, cf., e.g., Y. IBUKI, "Gedankenaufbau und Hintergrund des 3. Kapitels des Johannevangeliums", *BSU* 14 (1978) 9-33, esp. 11. Ibuki distinguishes two passages in John 2,23-3,36, which are divided into three parts: an exposition (2,23-25 - 3,22-24) is followed by a dialogue (3,1-12 - 3,25-30) and finally by a monologue (3,13-21 - 3,31-36).

⁽¹⁸⁾ R.A. CULPEPPER, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia 1983) 73.

⁽¹⁹⁾ CULPEPPER, *Anatomy*, 73. Already for H. WINDISCH, "John's Narrative Style", *The Gospel of John as Literature* (Selected and Introduced by M.W.G. STIBBE) (NTTS 17; Leiden - New York - Köln 1993) 27, only two of the Johannine miracle stories, the healing of the man born blind and the raising of Lazarus, belong to "the broadly elaborated, dramatically presented narratives".

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf., e.g., BARRETT, *Gospel According to St. John*, 368, who designates John 10,1-18. as a "comment upon ch 9"; B. KOWALSKI, *Die Hirtenrede (Joh 10,1-18) im Kontext des Johannevangeliums* (SBB 31; Stuttgart 1996) 193-194. See also LEE, *Symbolic Narratives*, 163.

discourses in 5,19-47⁽²¹⁾. John 6 already shows another structure, for the chapter begins with a double miracle and is closed by conflict scenes in 6,60-66⁽²²⁾. The speech itself is interrupted by questions and objections from its hearers⁽²³⁾. Michael Theobald characterizes John 6,60-71 as a dialogue passage that is closed by an important confession. For formal parallels he points to John 9 (9,38) and John 4 (4,42)⁽²⁴⁾. This observation is striking in some ways. Nevertheless, there are formal differences between these texts. John 4,1-42 is not built on a narrative text; there is only a very small narrative framework on which the dialogues between Jesus and the other protagonists are based. John 11,1-44 again diverges from a strict scheme by putting longer dialogues into the narrative framework of the miracle story. The changing of water into wine in Cana (John 2,1-11) and the healing of the son of the royal official (4,46-54) completely fall out of the scheme in which the signs are followed by dialogue texts.

The formal differences observed by Culpepper might be connected with different compositional aims of the author of the gospel. The Fourth Evangelist uses different forms to integrate traditions into his gospel and to reread them⁽²⁵⁾. In John 2-4 we can find some shadows of the conflict, which is already mentioned in John 1,1-14. However, it is more important that this section of the Gospel presents characters who meet Jesus and believe in him (see below I.3). The *logos* is in his world and there are people who

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. C.H. DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge repr. 1955) 354ff.; see also KOWALSKI, *Hirtenrede*, 190-191; LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*, 374-377.

⁽²²⁾ On the structure of John 6 cf., e.g., J. BEUTLER, "Zur Struktur von Johannes 6", *Studien zu den johanneischen Schriften* (ed. id.) (SBAB 25; Stuttgart 1998) 247-262. Eng. trans.: "The Structure of John 6", *Critical Readings of John 6* (ed. R.A. CULPEPPER) 115-127.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. WINDISCH, *John's Narrative Style*, 41. Therefore, M. THEOBALD, "Schriftzitate im 'Lebensbrot'-Dialog Jesu (Joh 6)", *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. C.M. TUCKETT) (BETL 131; Leuven 1997) 327-366, characterizes John 6,22-59 as a dialogue.

⁽²⁴⁾ M. THEOBALD, "Häresie von Anfang an?", *Ekklesiologie des Neuen Testaments. Für Karl Kertelge* (ed. R. KAMPLING – T. SÖDING) (Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1996) 212-246, esp. 222-223.

⁽²⁵⁾ On the same grounds I would oppose Christian Welck's assumption that there was a special literary form for the Johannine miracle stories called "johanneische Wundergeschichten" (Ch. WELCK, *Erzählte Zeichen* [WUNT II/69; Tübingen 1994] 236-278).

believe in Jesus; the reader is invited also to believe. In most cases, the Evangelist adds discourse passages to the narrative units he found in his tradition. In composing discourse texts he probably also used traditional material⁽²⁶⁾. This technique enables him to build colourful scenes that are sometimes more impressive than the formal synoptic parallels. The different structure of these scenes, the changing narrative strategies, and the diverging sequence of narrative, dialogical, and monological texts form individual units expressing different intentions. Therefore we have to read every miracle narrative in its own right. Only John 5 and 9 may be read together because of the structural parallels. Both stories are about a man cured by Jesus. But both persons act differently. Only the man born blind believes in Jesus. There are two different possibilities for the reader to read the signs; one can believe or one may refuse the high christological belief of the author of the Fourth Gospel. John 2–4 shows that the main aim in the Gospel is to awaken belief or perhaps to strengthen belief (cf. also 20,30-31).

These different strategies might have their reason in the different forms of tradition used by the writer of the gospel. For example, in John 5 and John 9 the dialogical structure of the whole narrative is prepared by the form of the tradition. In both chapters the narrator uses Sabbath conflict stories which were expanded by discourses⁽²⁷⁾.

What about the literary or theological hierarchy between miracle story and discourse genre? Formally, the compositional role of the Johannine miracle stories cannot be considered to be marginal. John 2,1-11 forms an accentuated prelude not only for the 'ring composition' 2,1–4,54 but also for all further signs: John 2,1-11 as the ἀρχή τῶν σημείων is the first of all the signs and it functions as

(²⁶) Sometimes it is assumed that "the author of the Fourth Gospel did not compose these discourses *de novo*, but utilized and expanded older existing discourses"; cf. H. KOESTER, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (London 1990) 257. Such older traditional dialogues can be found, e.g., in John 5,39-40.45-47 (*Gospels*, 259); see also id., "Gnostic Sayings and Controversy Traditions in John 8:12-59", *Nag Hammadi Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (ed. by C.W. HEDRICK – R. HODGSON) (Peabody 1986) 97-110. Another representative of those who presuppose a dialogue source used by the Fourth Evangelist is L. SCHENKE, "Der 'Dialog Jesu mit den Juden' im Johannesevangelium", *NTS* 34 (1988) 573-603; id., "Joh 7–10: Eine dramatische Szene", *ZNW* 80 (1989) 172-192.

(²⁷) Cf. LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*, 243-256, 341-365.

an introduction that provides an interpretation to all of them⁽²⁸⁾. In the light of the interpretation given in 2,11 the signs serve to promote faith in Jesus, the Son of God, that leads to true life (cf. 20,30-31). The echo of 1,14 (ὁ λόγος ... ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ) determines the force of 2,11. Reading 2,11 in the light of 1,14 means that the *doxa* inherent in the earthly Jesus becomes visible in all his miracles. And the last sign reaches back to it (John 11,4.40). So the macro-structure of the gospel shows that the narrative importance of the miracle stories is not meant to be corrected in favour of other text genres. The *doxa* of the Son of God that is visible in the signs helps to promote belief, which corresponds to the stated overall plan of the gospel. Both the discourses and monologues as well as the actions of the revealer divide people into believers or non-believers. Both lead up to the conflict and both genres are to be read together and they interpret one another.

B. Semantic Lines and their importance for the Narration of the Signs

The Fourth Gospel is in some ways a masterpiece in its use of internal references that lead the reader to the meaning of its narrated world. The Fourth Evangelist also makes great play with semantic fields and semantic lines. By the term 'semantic lines' I mean intratextual references that function as hermeneutical links. Semantic lines work by taking up slightly revised wordings or by taking up pictures and situations already mentioned by the use of analogous words or word families.

The use of this technique in binding together different parts of the gospel is an indication that the Fourth Gospel is not only composed so that some parts of it were read in the Christian worship, but also so that it could be read as a written document, as a book⁽²⁹⁾.

⁽²⁸⁾ Cf. W. WILKENS, *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des vierten Evangeliums* (Zürich 1958) 40; cf., e.g., W. NICOL, *The Semeia in the Fourth Gospel* (NTS 32; Leiden 1972) 114; B. OLSSON, *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel* (CB.NT 6; Lund 1974) 67, stresses that ἀρχή means both "initium and principum (sic!)".

⁽²⁹⁾ Cf. also P. MÜLLER, "Was ich geschrieben habe, das habe ich geschrieben", *Logos und Buchstabe* (ed. by G. SELLIN – F. VOUGA. In collaboration with S. ALKIER – A. CORNILS – K. HEINEMANN) (TANZ 20; Tübingen – Basel 1997) 153-173.

A. VON HARNACK, *Über den privaten Gebrauch der heiligen Schriften in*

Of course, it is not possible in what follows to analyse the whole semantic network of connections between the miracle stories and their immediate context. However, it can be shown that the miracle stories are narrated as a part of their new context and that both things happen: they interpret their context and they are interpreted by their context. There is no theological or hermeneutical hierarchy that disavows the signs. The miracle tradition has been connected by semantic lines with the context, so that co-ordinated pictures emerge. This is the helpful part of Jan A. du Rand's search for the cotexts of the miracles. He assumes that the miracles may be understood in close connection with dialogical or monological discourse texts as 'intratextual cotexts' ⁽³⁰⁾ that provide important information for the reader of the signs.

The meaning of the connection of the context by semantic lines can be shown for example in John 2. The catchword *σημεῖον* is the crucial keyword that is repeated immediately in the cleansing of the temple (2,13-22) and the critical notice of the faith of the people in Jerusalem in 2,23-25. Both texts have their own function but that function cannot be determined without paying attention to the entire narrative of the Fourth Gospel. Jesus' temple word refers the cleansing of the temple to the passion and the resurrection ⁽³¹⁾. The notice in 2,23-25, on the other hand, precedes the Nicodemus

der Alten Kirche (Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament V; Leipzig 1912) 33, argues for an early private use of the holy books in early Christianity; for early Christian libraries cf. now M. HENGEL, *Die Evangelienüberschriften* (SHAW.PH 1984,3; Heidelberg 1984) 37-39. ("Gemeindebibliotheken"). However, it is another and rather tricky question as to whether the Fourth Gospel was intentionally written for private use outside the Johannine school. Perhaps the final redaction of the Fourth Gospel aimed at a broader reading public; cf. HENGEL, *Die Evangelienüberschriften*, 32.

⁽³⁰⁾ J.A. DU RAND, *Johannine Perspectives I* (Doornfontain 1991) 93-94. On the linguistic definition of cotexts cf. E.R. WENDLAND, "A Tale of Two Debtors: On the Interaction of Text, Cotext, and Context in a New Testament Dramatic Narrative (Luke 7:36-50)", *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation* (ed. by D.A. BLACK – K. BARNWELL – S. LEVINSOHN; Nashville 1992) 101-143, esp. 115 ("The cotext of a given text, or oral/written speech event, is any discourse that is somehow associated with it in linguistic or literary terms. We might distinguish between two types of cotext; the intratextual, which refers to any passage that is related to another within the demarcated text itself; and intertextual, which then applies to any other relevant text").

⁽³¹⁾ Cf., e.g., U. SCHNELLE, "Die Tempelreinigung und die Christologie des Johannesevangeliums", *NTS* 42 (1996) 359-373.

dialogue (3,1-21). The relation between the sign, the revelation of the *doxa*, and the resulting faith in John 2,1-11 gets an important supplement from the other two pericopes. Pointing to the final aim of Jesus' mission, to death and resurrection, the cleansing of the temple draws the reader's attention to the overall theme of the sending of the Son. The Son sent into the world by his Father finally returns back to him with a soteriological aim (cf., e.g., 12,24; 14,2-3). The critique in 2,23-25 clearly indicates that not everyone seeing the signs will become a true believer. The miracle as a σημεῖον stands for the visibility of the *doxa* (2,11) that may lead to belief in so far as the person who sees the *doxa* is led to knowledge about the origin of Jesus, his having been sent from the Father, and the aim to be achieved by his descent into the world. This view is developed by the prologue in John 1 that the *implied reader* is referred to⁽³²⁾. With this interpretation a further semantic line was developed which leads back to the prologue; this line shows that the narrator ties up different texts, insinuating connections by carefully planted clues in order to waken a commensurate understanding. However, the sign can also lead to a misunderstanding and a defective or an unreal belief. The semantic line that the word σημεῖον in John 2 opens up shows how belief and signs belong together: only the reader who recognizes that in the signs the *doxa* becomes apparent is led to belief. The one who understands the miracle only as a miraculous deed does not grasp the theological and christological depth of the *semeion*.

C. The semantic inventory and the possible growth of the text (John 6)⁽³³⁾

There is a change in the meaning of the catchwords in John 6, and we find in recent literature a thorough discussion of whether

⁽³²⁾ Cf. F.J. MOLONEY, *Belief in the Word. Reading John 1-4* (Minneapolis 1993) 12: "He (the author) is interested in the reader's being called to decision in the light of what has been told in the prologue". On this fundamental reader-guiding function of the prologue see also J. ZUMSTEIN, "Der Prozeß der Relecture in der johanneischen Literatur", *NTS* 42 (1996) 394-411, esp. 403; U. SCHNELLE, "Johannes als Geisttheologe", *NT* 40 (1998) 17-31, esp. 18.

For the reference back to John 1,14 cf., e.g., P.P.A. KOTZÉ, "John and reader's response", *Neotest* 19 (1985) 50-63, esp. 55; B. LINDARS, *The Gospel of John* (NCEB; reprinted paperback edition; Grand Rapids - London 1992) 132.

⁽³³⁾ For the different approaches to John 6 in the newer research cf. now R.A. CULPEPPER (ed.) *John 6, passim*.

John 6 is to be read as a coherent literary unit⁽³⁴⁾ or whether there is a sacramental shift in the meaning of these words in this section that cannot be understood as the work of one author⁽³⁵⁾ Agreed there is a change in meaning between the feeding of the five thousand and the speech. In the feeding of the five thousand 'bread' (6,5.7.9.11.13; see also 6,23.26) and 'eating' are employed in their concrete meaning (6,5; see also 6,23.26); later there is a change to a metaphorical meaning: 'To eat' (6,31.50-51) stands for getting eternal life by believing that Jesus is God's bread of life (6,31-35.41.47-48.50-51). By being the bread of life given by God, Jesus is the mediator of life to everybody who believes in him.

Nevertheless, there is also a third meaning of 'to eat' (τρώγω: 6,54.56-58; φαγεῖν: 6,52-53.58). In John 6,51c-58, the narrator refers to a concrete eating of the eucharistic bread (6,51c.58)⁽³⁶⁾. It seems to be easier to understand this change as a *relecture* ⁽³⁷⁾ of the miracle

⁽³⁴⁾ Cf. now, e.g., with different arguments P.N. ANDERSON, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel* (WUNT II/78; Tübingen 1996); BEUTLER, *Struktur, passim*; J. CROSSAN, "It is Written: A Structuralist Analysis of John 6", *Semeia* 26 (1983) 3-21; G. SEGALLA, "La complessa struttura letteraria di Giovanni 6", *Teologia* 15 (1990) 68-89, esp. 71ff.; M. GIRARD, "L'unité de composition de Jean 6, au regard de l'analyse structurelle", *EeT(O)* 13 (1982) 79-110.

⁽³⁵⁾ Cf., e.g., E. LOHSE, "Wort und Sakrament im Johannesevangelium", id., *Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen 1976) 193-208, esp. 199-203; cf. also the documentation by M. ROBERGE, "Le discours sur le pain de vie Jean 6,22-59", *LTP* 38 (1982) 265-299, esp. 279-284.

⁽³⁶⁾ For the sacramentalistic interpretation of John 6,51c-58 cf., e.g., SCHNELLE, *Antidocetic Christology*, 201-203; however, Schnelle disputes the secondary character of John 6,51c-58. Although he underscores the narrative change in the discourse, he opts for an original interpretation of the bread of life discourse by the Fourth Evangelist. Some authors dispute the sacramental interpretation of this passage: cf., e.g., J.D.G. DUNN, "John VI – A Eucharistic Discourse?", *NTS* 17 (1970/71) 328-338; M.J.J. MENKEN, "John 6,51c-58: Eucharist or Christology?", *Critical Readings of John 6* (ed. R.A. CULPEPPER) 183-204; MOLONEY, *Signs and Shadows*, 53-57, points out that the emphasis is laid on the passion of Jesus; see also B. LINDARS, "Word and Sacrament in the Fourth Gospel", *Essays on John* (ed. C.M. TUCKETT) (SNTA 17; Leuven 1992) 51-65, esp. 62.

⁽³⁷⁾ For the term *relecture* cf. J. ZUMSTEIN, *Der Prozeß der Relecture, passim*; id., "Zur Geschichte des johanneischen Christentums", *ThLZ* 122 (1997) 417-428; A. DETTWILER, *Die Gegenwart des Erhöhten. Eine exegetische Studie zu den johanneischen Abschiedsreden (Joh 13,31-16,33) unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Relecture-Charakters* (FRLANT 169; Göttingen 1995). See also K. SCHOLTISSEK, "Johannine Studies", *CR:BS* (1998) 227-259; id.,

story and its earlier interpretation⁽³⁸⁾. The participation in Jesus by believing is actualized in the sacramental practice of the early church and probably that is also equally the case in the Johannine church. Adding a sacramental interpretation to the bread of life discourse actualizes the older layer of the text with reference to the practice of the Johannine community. The *relecture* uses the semantic resources of the text. Therefore, the first readers in the Johannine school who transmit the gospel text to their community take up the literary techniques of the gospel in actualizing it for the next generation of readers of the gospel.

The author of the gospel who composes the sequence of the miracle stories and the revelatory discourse may have given a deeper meaning also to the feeding and to the walking on water. These miracles are narrated as acts of Jesus in which the life-giving power of the revealer becomes visible to the people and to the disciples of Jesus⁽³⁹⁾. In the first act Jesus gives bread to the people. Giving food to the people provides a basic requirement of life. Having enough food to eat is neither in ancient nor in modern times a universal fact for human beings. Therefore, a lot of folktales from different ages are dealing with the theme of supernatural reception of food or with people being satisfied even by a small amount of food. The Johannine story has some kind of utopian hope in common with these folktales. But the Johannine reader may learn that this existential hope is fulfilled by the eschatological event of the coming of the sent Son. The sign illustrates Jesus as the one who is the bread of life because he makes human life possible by giving bread to the people. In the second act, John 6,16-21, Jesus is portrayed as saving life in danger. The nearness of Jesus who reaches his disciples in the stormy and dangerous night (John 6,17-18) eliminates the danger (John 6,19-21). The fact that the author does not tell us

“Relecture – zu einem neu entdeckten Programmwort der Schriftauslegung (mit Blick auf das Johannesevangelium)”, *BiLi* 70 (1997) 309-315.

⁽³⁸⁾ ZUMSTEIN, *Der Prozeß der Relecture*, 406.

⁽³⁹⁾ Cf. H. WEDER, “Die Menschwerdung Gottes”, *Einblicke ins Evangelium* (ed. id.) (Göttingen 1992) 363-400; 373: “Wichtig ist ..., daß das Brotwunder nicht formalisiert wird, als ob in ihm bloß noch die Faktizität der Messianität bestätigt würde. Die Messianität hat vielmehr die Gestalt, daß er überraschend speist, Brot darreicht in Hülle und Fülle. Als Messias teilt er das elementare Lebensmittel ungefragt aus”. See also E. RUCKSTUHL, “Wesen und Kraft der Eucharistie in der Sicht des Johannesevangeliums”, *Das Opfer der Kirche* (ed. R. ERNI et al.) (Luzerner Theologische Studien 1; Luzern 1954) 47-90, esp. 50.

anything more about the danger of the disciples after the arrival of Jesus at the ship is an indication that there is no place for life-destroying danger when Jesus comes into community with his believers. By establishing life by providing food and by being near to people as a saviour of life in the face of life-destroying danger, Jesus is depicted as God's powerful bread of life. Therein, Jesus is the answer of God to the fundamental hopes of humanity.

3. *Tradition and compositional formation of the Gospel*

The title of this paper is meant to focus attention on the reception of tradition by the Fourth Evangelist. More than fifty years ago the question of the origin of the Johannine miracle tradition was answered on the assumption that the Fourth Evangelist used a miracle source, called the *semeia-* or *signs-source*. The most important contribution to this theory was made by Rudolf Bultmann⁽⁴⁰⁾. The theory of one written source containing the whole miracle tradition and other texts is rightly criticized and rejected in much of the more recent investigations of the Fourth Gospel⁽⁴¹⁾. However, I agree with those who posit a two-miracle source, which includes the changing of water into wine in 2,1-11 and the healing from a distance in 4,46-54⁽⁴²⁾. The source-critical hint can be found in 2,12a (journey to

(⁴⁰) Cf. his commentary on John: R. BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (KEK 2, Göttingen 201985). Cf., e.g., the survey presented by G. VAN BELLE, *The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel* (BETL 116; Leuven 1994). Two other scholars belonging to the number of the famous followers of this hypothesis are Jürgen Becker and Robert T. Fortna. Both scholars develop the hypothesis of Bultmann by tracing back more material to the assumed source; cf. J. BECKER, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes I* (ÖTK 4/1; Gütersloh – Würzburg 31991); R.T. FORTNA, *The Gospel of Signs* (SNTSMS 11; Cambridge 1970); id., *The Fourth Gospel and its Predecessor* (Edinburgh 1989). Fortna elaborates this theory by assuming a 'Gospel of Signs' which contains the sign stories as well as a passion narrative.

(⁴¹) Cf., e.g., SCHNELLE, *Antidocetic Christology*, *passim*; D. MARGUERAT, "La 'Source des Signes' existe-t-elle?", *La communauté Johannique et son histoire* (ed. by J.-D. KAESTLI – J.-M. POFFET – J. ZUMSTEIN) (Le monde de la bible; Genève 1990) 69-93, esp. 75-89; F. NEIRYNCK, "The Sign Source in the Fourth Gospel", *Evangelica II* (ed. F. VAN SEGBROECK) (BETL 99; Leuven 1991) 651-678; U. WILCKENS, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD 4; Göttingen 1998) 9.

(⁴²) For this small signs source cf., e.g., BARRETT, *Gospel According to St. John*, 245-246; SCHNELLE, *Antidocetic Christology*, 84; see also G.R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John* (WBC 36; Waco 1987) 34, 67, 71.

Capernaum). This itinerary fits well with 4,46b (the royal official in Capernaum) but disturbs the present context where the real target of the journey of Jesus is Jerusalem with the cleansing of the temple⁽⁴³⁾. Jesus, his mother, his brothers, and his disciples reached Capernaum without staying there for a long time (cf. 2,12).

Probably, there was a source, but a source which the evangelist has woven into his larger cloth. Without depending fully on his tradition, the narrator dissolves the connection between the wine miracle and the healing in order to form an introductory 'ring composition'⁽⁴⁴⁾. A *ring composition* is a narrative form that leads the reader, after an introduction through a narrative digression or excursus consisting of an intermediary section, back to the point of departure. This is indicated by repeating words or motifs from the initial passage⁽⁴⁵⁾. The narrative form of the 'ring composition' in John 2,1 to 4,54 is clearly indicated by the reference back from 4,46a.54 to the introductory passage in 2,1-11:

- 4,46a Ἦλθεν οὖν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ὅπου ἐποίησεν
τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον.
4,54 Τοῦτο [δὲ] πάλιν δεύτερον σημεῖον ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλθὼν
ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.
2,1 Καὶ ... γάμος ἐγένετο ἐν Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ...
2,9 ... τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγεννημένον ...
2,11 Ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν Κανὰ τῆς
Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἐφάνερωσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπίστευσαν
(cf. 4,53) εἰς αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

(⁴³) For J. PAINTER, *The Quest for the Messiah* (Edinburgh 1993) 196, John 2,12 "breaks the sequence begun in John 1:19", indicating that John 2,1-11 forms a "bridge passage belonging both to 1.19-2.11 and 2.1-4.54". However, John 2,1-11 does not form a sequence with John 1,19-51; cf. LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*, 124-126.

(⁴⁴) Cf. F.J. MOLONEY, "From Cana to Cana (John 2:1-4:54) and the Fourth Evangelist's Concept of Correct (and Incorrect) Faith", *Studia Biblica 1978 II* (ed. by E.A. LIVINGSTONE) (JSNTSS 2; Sheffield 1980) 185-213, esp. 202; id., "Mary in the Fourth Gospel: Woman and Mother", *Sal 51* (1989) 421-440, 422-423; id., *The Gospel of John* (Sacra Pagina 4; Collegeville 1998) 63-65. See also, e.g., M.W.G. STIBBE, *John* (Readings; Sheffield 1993) 42-43. Although P.F. ELLIS, *The Genius of John* (Collegeville 1984) 9-10, mentions the literary technique of the ring composition in his composition-critical commentary on John, he does not recognize the use of this technique in John 2,1-4,54. Accordingly he proposes a somewhat artificial structure of the whole gospel that destroys the narrative units (cf. also his structure of John 6,10-21).

(⁴⁵) Cf. I. BERG, *Die Ringkomposition bei Herodot und ihre Bedeutung für die Beweistechnik* (Spudasmata 25; Hildesheim - New York 1971) 4-26.

In the passages that frame the second narrated sign in John, words are found that were already used in narrating the first miracle (cf. especially the geographical setting; see also the explicit reference back to the first sign with nearly identical wording and the counting of only these two signs).

Two literary forms of ring compositions' can be distinguished⁽⁴⁶⁾. First, there is the *anaphoric form* of the 'ring composition': the later passage refers back to the introductory passage after a narrative excursus or digression. Second, there is an *inclusive form* of the compositional technique: the introductory passage, the middle part, and the final passage should be read as one unit of thought. John 2,1–4,54 should be interpreted in terms of the latter form. In a literary work without the possibility of using headlines the Fourth Evangelist adopts this literary technique for *indicating a narrative unit*.

In searching for the narrative aim of this 'ring composition' we observe a succession of people confronted with the revealer, his words and his doings. These persons were led to belief. The fact that the positive reaction leads from the disciples to the Samaritans to a βασιλικός could have a special significance, if this man is, as is frequently assumed, a Gentile⁽⁴⁷⁾. In the light of the whole gospel narrative one may add Nicodemus to the list of believers in Jesus⁽⁴⁸⁾. The conclusion of the 'ring composition' demonstrates the deeper truth in the confession of the revealer as ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου by the Samaritans (4,42); this confession is not only the climax of John 4,4ff⁽⁴⁹⁾, but it is also the climax of the 'ring composition' in John 2,1–4,54. The last miracle story of this composition testifies that by healing the Gentile's son Jesus truly is the σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου. Like the disciples of Jesus (2,11) and the Samaritans (4,42), the Gentile member of the royal court and the members of the Gentile's house

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Cf., e.g., BERG, *Ringkomposition*, 1-2.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Cf., e.g., BECKER, *Evangelium I*, 224; A.H. MEAD, "The βασιλικός in John 4.46–53", *JSNT* 23 (1985) 69-72; MOLONEY, *From Cana to Cana*, 196; SCHNELLE, *Antidocetic Christology*, 83. Differently, e.g., I. DUNDERBERG, *Johannes und die Synoptiker* (AASF.DHL 69; Helsinki 1994) 96-97; LOHSE, "Miracles", 46-47.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Cf., e.g., PAINTER, *Quest*, 198, who interprets the act of the burial of Jesus (John 19,38-42) as "an act of openness and faith" although it does not show "true comprehension of the significance of Jesus".

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Cf., e.g., C.R. KOESTER, "'The Savior of the World' (John 4:42)", *JBL* 109 (1990) 665-680, esp. 665.

also believe in the sent Son (4,54) and they all serve as paradigms for the implied readers.

As well as the introductory ring composition the other sign stories adopted by the Evangelist show the productive relation between the use of tradition and the composition of the Gospel. The two Sabbath conflict stories which are adopted by the Evangelist — John 5 and John 9 — were used by the Fourth Evangelist in the account of the growing conflict with the unbelieving world that forms the unifying frame for chapters 5–10⁽⁵⁰⁾. The miracle sequence of the feeding of the five thousand and the crossing of the sea was inserted in chapter 6 and got its own geographical and conflict-oriented scenario: the people who stand close to the revealer also take offence at him and the *krisis* is carried out in them. This leads also to John 11. In the narration of the raising of Lazarus the Evangelist connects the first part of his book with the passion narrative by pointing out that the last miracle together with the other signs is the reason for putting Jesus to death (11,47; see above I.1).

II. Observations on the Microstructure

In pursuit of his literary aim the Fourth Evangelist adapts the miracle traditions to his literary concerns in the structure of the gospel. Therefore, we can assume that he also changes the words and structure of the tradition, an assumption that is supported by modern analysis of oral tradition⁽⁵¹⁾. According to these theories the written text erases the form of the oral tradition. Although there may be more continuity between the oral and the written unit than is often allowed in these theories⁽⁵²⁾, the question should be raised as to the ways in which the author has changed his traditions. The following steps do not attempt to give a complete analysis of the

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Some scholars try to establish a more original order. Methodologically it is very difficult to adopt this theory because there is no evidence for a version of John with the hypothetical reconstructed order. For a thorough critique of changing the order of the gospel text cf. U. SCHNELLE, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (UTB 1830; Göttingen 1996) 552–554.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Cf., e.g., G. SELLIN, “‘Gattung’ und ‘Sitz im Leben’ auf dem Hintergrund der Problematik von Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit synoptischer Erzählungen”, *EvT* 50 (1990) 311–331; see also J. SCHRÖTER, *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte* (WMANT 76; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1997) 40–65.

⁽⁵²⁾ Cf. LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*, 94–95, 98–99.

wording of the tradition and of the rewording in the gospel⁽⁵³⁾. They present only some exemplary observations on the technique by which the writer modifies his traditions in order to change the point of view of his readers.

1. Context-oriented interpretation of the tradition

In different ways the miracle tradition runs into the narrative context. First of all, the already mentioned 'semantic lines' have to be considered. The connection of tradition with a larger text by insertion into the chronological and geographical structure of the narrative whole is an important and well-known feature. Important are also the itineraries by which the narrator leads his protagonist to Jerusalem: e.g. 5,1; 7,1ff.

The literary penetration of the tradition becomes recognisable in the explicit references forward and backward in the narrative according to the technique of "anachrony"⁽⁵⁴⁾: cf., e.g., John 4,46.56 (πάλιν) → 2,1-12; 10,31-39 → 9,3-4 and 5,17; 11,47; 12,10-11.17 → 11,1-44; 11,7 → 10,31-33 (see also 8,59)⁽⁵⁵⁾; 11,37 → chap. 9; 11,4 is probably a proleptic hint to the reader that Jesus will do a sign⁽⁵⁶⁾. The enumeration of the first two signs signals that these two miracle stories form the beginning and ending of a text unit in the narrative (see above I.3). Simultaneously, the keyword ἀρχή functions as a reference to the further tale in a double sense: first, it suggests that the wine miracle is a model for the interpretation of the further signs. Secondly, it calls this miracle the beginning of the signs, the first one, which will be followed by another sign labelled as the second sign and other non-enumerated signs. As an expressed reference backward, the remark in 6,2: ἐθεώρουν τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίησεν ἐπὶ τῶν ὁσθευνόντων is valid, although it is not completely clear

⁽⁵³⁾ Cf. therefore, LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*, 120-465.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Cf. G. GENETTE, *Narrative Discourse* (Ithaca 1980) 33-84; on these stylistic phenomena cf. E. LÄMMERT, *Bauformen des Erzählens* (Stuttgart 1955).

⁽⁵⁵⁾ This reference is emphasized by D. BURKETT, "Two Accounts of Lazarus's Resurrection in John 11", *NT* 36 (1994) 209-232, esp. 228-229.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Cf. MOLONEY, *Signs and Shadows*, 156. For a study of proleptic hints in John 6 cf. F.J. MOLONEY, "The Function of Prolepsis in the Interpretation of John 6", *Critical Readings of John 6* (ed. R.A. CULPEPPER) 129-148, esp. 132-147.

whether it primarily refers back to 4,46-54 and 5,1-9⁽⁵⁷⁾, or whether it refers to a knowledge of healing stories beyond the text level⁽⁵⁸⁾.

A further example of a more elaborated form of the context-oriented interpretation of the tradition is the Lazarus narrative which is made part of the reference system of the gospel as a whole; this shows that the text has a crucial meaning as a watershed in the narrated saga of the revealer.

2. Reader-directed comments

Wolfgang Iser stresses the importance of reader-directed remarks in a narrative:

"The comments may provoke a variety of reactions. They can disconcert, arouse opposition, charm with contradiction, and frequently uncover many unexpected features of the narrative process, which without these clues one might not have noticed. And so such comments do not provide any definite assessment of the events; rather, they offer an assessment that contains different possibilities open to the reader's choice"⁽⁵⁹⁾.

The investigation of the tradition does not only show that the Fourth Evangelist frequently composes dialogue forms and misunderstandings but also that he instructs his readers through comments and commentaries and that he enriches his stories by the use of irony (cf., e.g., John 9)⁽⁶⁰⁾. For theological reasons the reaction of the reader provoked by the comments in the narrative is not arbitrary; the reader's reaction is the choice between belief and unbelief, and therefore, the choice between life and death. Prominent examples are the interpretation signals in 2,11 and 11,4. The importance of these signals for the theology of the Johannine signs should not be underestimated. These signals are "implicit reception

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Cf., e.g., U. SCHNELLE, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (ThHK 4; Leipzig 1998) 115.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Other scholars point to John 4,45: e.g. FORTNA, *The Fourth Gospel and its Predecessor*, 85.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ W. ISER, "Indeterminacy and the Reader's Response in Prose Fiction", *Aspects of Narrative* (ed. J.H. MILLER) (New York – London 1971) 1-45, 19. On the role of editorial comments in John see also R.A. CULPEPPER, *Anatomy*, 17-18; F.J. MOLONEY, "Who is 'the Reader' in/of the Fourth Gospel?" *AusBR* 40 (1992) 20-33, esp. 23-24.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ For a longer list of the literary techniques also used in composing the miracle stories by the evangelist cf., e.g., ELLIS, *The Genius of John*, 6-11.

instructions" ("implizite Rezeptionsanweisungen") which are meant to establish "communication with the intended readers" ("die Kommunikation mit den intendierten Lesern")⁽⁶¹⁾. Sporadic direct addresses in the second person plural that cannot be explained in terms of the narrative alone can be explained as direct instructions to the reader (e.g. 4,48⁽⁶²⁾; 20,30-31)⁽⁶³⁾. Some of these signals are part of the narrative framework by which the different traditions of the gospel are brought together (cf., e.g., 2,11; 4,54; 6,25b-29; 9,39-41): "they often commend the passage into belief and life through the authority of Jesus or the narrator"⁽⁶⁴⁾.

3. *The narrative depiction of the sovereignty of the revealer in connection with his role as the one who is sent*

An essential stylistic method that the Fourth Evangelist uses for adapting single miracle stories drawn from the tradition has been noticed especially by Charles H. Giblin. He has drawn our attention to that special form in his essay of 1980⁽⁶⁵⁾. Elements of this method are common to miracle stories but it seems that the pattern was consciously used by the Fourth Evangelist. Giblin characterises this scheme in the following manner: "... he (sc. Jesus) proceeds to act positively after giving a negative response to a suggestion that has been presented to him in view of something considered to be an urgent need"⁽⁶⁶⁾. He has shown that these elements return in different Johannine texts (John 2,1-11; 4,46-54; 7,2-14 and 11,1-44). This

⁽⁶¹⁾ J. FREY, "Der implizite Leser und die biblischen Texte", *Theologische Beiträge* 23 (1992) 266-290, esp. 281.

⁽⁶²⁾ Cf. LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*, 178.

⁽⁶³⁾ Cf. MOLONEY, *Reader*, 23; F. SCHNIDER – W. STENGER, *Johannes und die Synoptiker* (Biblische Handbibliothek 9; München 1971) 82.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ B.W. HENAULT, "John 4:43-54 and the ambivalent narrator. A response to Culpepper's Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel", *SR* 19 (1990) 287-304, esp. 298.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ C.H. GIBLIN, "Suggestion, Negative Response, and Positive Action in St John's Portrayal of Jesus (John 2,1-11; 4,46-54; 7, 2-14; 11,1-11)", *NTS* 26 (1980) 197-211.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ GIBLIN, *Suggestion*, 197; MOLONEY, *Mary*, 423: 'problem', 'request', 'rebuke', 'reaction' und 'consequence'. J. PAINTER, "Quest and Rejection stories in John", *JSNT* 36 (1989) 17-46, places these texts in the broader context of quest and rejection stories; cf. id., *Quest*, 163-165, 267-284, 367-381. Therefore, for Painter more Johannine texts belong to this scheme: e.g. John 6,1-40.

scheme can be developed on the basis of the miracle stories in John 2 and 4. John 11 is a variation of this scheme. A further step in this literary scheme is the continuing confidence in the miracle worker (2,5; 4,49; see also 11,21.31) which is important for the ongoing narrative. Therefore I want to propose a fourfold structure:

<i>Request</i>	<i>objection</i>	<i>continuing confidence</i>	<i>positive act</i>
2,3b	2,4	2,5	2,7-8
4,47	4,48	4,49	4,50
11,3 (indirect request)	11,6	(11,21.32 expression of confidence not expecting actual help)	11,43-44
see also: 7,3-4	7,[5.]6-8	—	7,10; cf. 7,14.28; 8,20 ⁽⁶⁷⁾

The pattern serves the theological interpretation of the miracle stories and their integration into the narrative unit of the gospel. It puts the miraculous action of Jesus into intimate connection with his sending by his Father⁽⁶⁸⁾. The one who is in a close relation with the Father (cf., e.g., 1,18; 10,15.30.38; 14,9) decides what to do. It is not the request of any person or any situation that forces the action of the revealer. He rather works according to his own and his father's will. It is also hardly by chance that this scheme was used with both the first two miracles as well as with the last miracle. The miracles are a legitimate part of the depiction of the eschatological revelation of the incarnate *logos* in history. They show the *doxa* of the revealer as a *doxa* that stems from the Father. They are, however, only understood in the right way when they are not misinterpreted in an earthly way. So John 2,1-11 and 4,46-54 also carry a polemical and pastoral component by rejecting a misunderstanding of the signs that could have been provided by the massive miracle tradition of the Johannine circle. Jesus' signs can be understood correctly only in overall connection with his sending by his Father.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ This is obviously a public manifestation of the revealer and therefore a positive act that corresponds to the request of his brothers (φανερώσων σεαυτὸν τῷ κόσμῳ; 7,4).

⁽⁶⁸⁾ Cf. also J.L. STALEY, "Reading myself, Reading the Text", "What is John?" (ed. F.F. SEGOVIA) (SBL Symposium Series 3; Atlanta 1996) 59-104, esp. 80-81.

III. Theological and Hermeneutical Conclusion

1. *The Evangelist as a narrator*

The author of the Fourth Gospel uses traditions for narrating his miracle stories. Sometimes he followed the form of his tradition. Often, however, he changed it fundamentally, so that the reconstruction of the tradition becomes difficult (especially in John 9 and 11)⁽⁶⁹⁾. He arranges the traditions anew and joins them together in many different manners in his literary context. For that reason we are justified in speaking of the Fourth Evangelist as a *narrator of the miracle stories*; a narrator who creatively accepts the basic claim of his tradition although he also narrates the signs according to the manner of his own theological way of thinking. This method of narration is clearly a theological or christological one. By narrating the miracle stories the author makes christological, theological, and anthropological claims. The miracles are told to portray Jesus as *God's giver of life* (see below III.2); in so far as people are seeing the signs or are hearing the narrated stories of these signs and are understanding them as signs of the sent revealer, they receive the true life. Receiving this life is anticipated in the signs that Jesus had done during his ministry on earth⁽⁷⁰⁾. Therefore, the narration of the signs repeats the *krisis* (the separation) into believers and unbelievers. But the aim of the writer of the Fourth Gospel in narrating the miracle stories is to awaken and to strengthen faith in Jesus (see below III.3).

2. *The johannine Jesus as the Life-Giver*

One of the main concerns in narrating the miracle stories is to portray Jesus as the mediator of true life. My thesis is this: always implicitly, but frequently explicitly the Fourth Evangelist portrays the Jesus who works signs as the *giver of life*⁽⁷¹⁾.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ Cf. the reconstruction in LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender, ad loc.*, with a discussion of the literature.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Cf. also WELCK, *Erzählte Zeichen*, 238-239.

⁽⁷¹⁾ See also LEE, *Symbolic Narratives*, 99: "The 'signs' are miraculous events that relate to material and physical reality and, through the narrative, become symbols of eschatological life". Cf. J. BEUTLER, *Habt keine Angst* (SBS 116; Stuttgart 1984) 49; J.P. MEIER, *A Marginal Jew. Vol. Two* (ABRL; New York – London – Toronto – Sydney – Auckland 1994) 799; M.M. THOMPSON, "Signs and Faith in the Fourth Gospel", *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 1 (1991) 89-108, esp. 97.

In Jesus God himself comes near to human beings to mediate life. This function of Jesus is especially developed in the bread of life discourse (John 6,25bff.). The earthly signs mirror the heavenly *doxa*, in so far as they are a sign of the life-mediating potential of the Son of God. Whoever, by seeing the signs, comes to belief as a God-given gift (6,44), to him or her is promised eternal life. There is also the need to remain (μένειν) in this life, which is especially testified by the true vine discourse: 15,4 (see also e.g., John 8,31-32; 5,37-38). This motif of abiding is however implicitly also connected with the telling of the miracle stories (cf. John 5,14).

3. *The Gospel as representation of the krisis of the One who has come to bring either life or judgement*

As is shown by Jean Zumstein, the rhetorical and argumentative strategy of the whole Gospel serves the aim of awaking belief in the reader⁽⁷²⁾. This idea is explicitly stressed by the final remark of the gospel, John 20,30-31. Referring to the σημεῖα γεγραμμένα the narrator calls the reader to belief. He points to the narrated signs of the literarily presented pre-easter Jesus and he asks the post-easter reader to believe because he or she has heard or read of the works of the Son of God written down in this narration. In the light of this final remark the aim of the whole gospel is to confront the reader with the eschatological word of God in order to evoke belief and participation in the life of God mediated by the Son he has sent⁽⁷³⁾.

The aim of the gospel in leading the reader to belief or in strengthening belief is also carried out by the way the miracle stories are narrated (cf. 2,11 is not only related to John 11, but also to 20,30-31)⁽⁷⁴⁾. In these stories, the Fourth Evangelist represents the

(72) Cf. ZUMSTEIN, *Geschichte*, 424; id., *Das Johannesevangelium*, *passim*, esp. 350: "Das Evangelium nach Johannes bietet ein hervorragendes Beispiel eines solchen Unternehmens, insofern es einerseits, unter einem rhetorischen Gesichtspunkt, explizit Glauben zu erwecken sucht und andererseits, unter einem argumentativen Gesichtspunkt, eine gut erkennbare Strategie in Bewegung setzt, dieses Ziel zu erreichen".

(73) Cf., e.g., ZUMSTEIN, *Johannesevangelium*, 351.

(74) Cf. John 20,30-31: Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ], ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ· ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύ[σ]ητε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

earthly Jesus in the colours of the exalted Christ for his present time, and he points out the actual meaning of Jesus Christ for the faith of the Johannine Christians. The miracle stories represent Jesus as the one who gives new life to the people. A twofold reaction of the reader is possible in the light of the narrated sign. There are some people who believe in Jesus or increase in christological insight and others who refuse the Johannine, christologically-qualified faith. Confronted with God's sent Son, the people have to believe in Jesus, otherwise they will not receive the gift of eternal life and will continue to belong to the unbelieving world (cf., e.g., 5,14; 9,39-41). With the help of the compositional order of the miracle stories and the various signals to guide the reader, the Fourth Evangelist tries to lead the implied reader into making a decision for the Son of God (cf., e.g., 4,48; 6,6). Therefore, the aim of the narrative remarks inserted into text by the Fourth Evangelist is to evoke a decision in the reader. The reader may come to faith and accept Jesus for the preservation of life according to the promise. Or the reader may refuse belief and so come under judgement. The commentaries of the Fourth Evangelist *update the separation* that is caused by the *krisis* of the earthly Jesus in an existential manner for the readers of the gospel.

So the miracle stories are a further example that the Fourth Evangelist narrates his christology in more or less carefully structured scenes to evoke life-giving faith in Jesus the Son of God⁽⁷⁵⁾. In the encounter with the Johannine narrative the reader faces Jesus and his claim that the reader should believe in him. Through the medium of the written word, Jesus and his claims are brought near to the readers at the time of the narrator and for all time. The reader is challenged to accept faith and life by believing in the narrated Jesus who is still alive in his community and has inspired the literary work⁽⁷⁶⁾. By writing a gospel dealing with

(⁷⁵) Cf. also ZUMSTEIN, *Johannesevangelium*, 351: "Der Schluß des Evangeliums betrachtet das nun vollendete johanneische Werk als ein Medium, das Glauben zu schaffen vermag. Durch die Vermittlung einer Erzählung also, welche das christologische Ereignis in Szene setzt und überliefert, entsteht Glauben".

(⁷⁶) This happens through the Paraclete (cf. 14,26). For this role of the Johannine Paraclete cf., e.g., SCHNELLE, *The Human Condition* (Edinburgh 1996) 136-137; id., "Johannes als Geisttheologe", 21; see also ZUMSTEIN, "Der Prozeß der Relecture", 410-411.

Jesus' demand, the author opens up a means by which the reader can form a relationship with the person about whom the gospel is written⁽⁷⁷⁾.

Martin-Luther-Universität,
Halle-Wittenberg
Mühlenstr. 44
D-38176 Wendeburg, Germany

Michael LABAHN

SUMMARY

An examination of the miracle stories in the context of the fourth gospel shows that the Evangelist, using different literary techniques, presents his tradition as an important part of his narrative. The Johannine signs are closely linked to the context and by no means subordinate to the other literary genres. By means of the signs basic reactions to the eschatological event of the coming of the Son of God are pointed out. Through the encounter with the revealer represented in the text possible readers are invited to accept him as a pledge of eternal life.

(77) MÜLLER, "Was ich geschrieben habe", 165; see also SCHNACKENBURG, *Jesus Christus im Spiegel der vier Evangelien* (Akzente; Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1998) 246.

Peace and Mercy Upon the Israel of God: The Old Testament Background of Galatians 6,16b ⁽¹⁾

Discussions of the Old Testament background of “new creation” in Gal 6,15 and its relation to v. 16 have heretofore been general and have not targeted any particular OT passage. This essay sets out to demonstrate that the phrase “peace and mercy” has its most probable background in the Old Testament promise of Israel’s restoration in Isaiah 54. In the light of this background the mention of the “marks” of Jesus on Paul’s body in v. 17 makes excellent sense.

I. Peace and Mercy in Galatians 6,16b and New Creation in Isaiah 54 and other OT texts

Verse 16b explains the blessing upon those who line up their lives according to the elemental, ethical rule of the new creation: “peace and mercy be upon them and (or “even”) upon the Israel of God”. Though the dominant notion of this “peace and mercy” pertains to God’s blessing upon people, it probably has overtones of the effect of that blessing: the ethical demeanor of striving for unity among those who live in the new creation. This is a positive way of saying that they are not people who have become “boastful ones, ones challenging one another, envying one another” (5,26).

This last expression of v. 16 has undergone explosive debate. Some understand “the Israel of God” to be a further definition of the preceding “them”, so that the entire Galatian church, Jewish and Gentile believers together, are referred to as true Israel. Grammatically, this view is certainly possible, since the καί can be rendered as appositional or explicative: “even”, “that is”, or “namely”⁽²⁾, with the resulting translation: “peace and mercy be upon them, that is, upon the Israel of God” (so RSV, New Living

(¹) I am grateful to my colleagues Moisés Silva and Royce Gruenler, as well as my students Jeffrey Herron and Kathy Stumcke, for their reading of this manuscript and for helpful suggestions.

(²) Cf. BAGD, 393, who sees the last two options as examples of an explicative use.

Translation, *JB*, Moffat [?])(³). Others understand the preceding “them” to refer to Gentile Christians and “the Israel of God” to allude to Jewish Christians: “peace and mercy be upon them, and upon the Israel of God” (⁴).

Those who have identified “the Israel of God” with the entire Galatian church (Jewish and Gentile believers) have usually done so because of the epistle’s main theme of unity between believers of different ethnic groups, and especially because of the notion that the nationalistic traits distinguishing the people of God in the old age no longer hold true for the people of God in the new age (⁵). Since the dominant message is one of doing away with national distinctions among God’s people (3,7-8.26-29; 4,26-31; 5,2-12), it would seem unlikely that Paul would conclude the epistle by referring to those in the church according to their ethnic distinctives. This idea is especially unlikely since 6,11-18, as the conclusion of the epistle, is intended by Paul to summarize its major themes (⁶).

(³) *RSV*: “Peace and mercy be upon all who walk by this rule, upon the Israel of God”; the New Living Translation: “May God’s mercy and peace be upon all those who live by this principle. They are the new people of God” (a footnote equates “new people of God” with “the Israel of God”); *JB*: “Peace and mercy to all who follow this rule, who form the Israel of God”.

(⁴) The following translations conform to this basic rendering and appear to favor this alternative: *NASB*, *NRSV*, *KJV*, *NKJV*, *NEB*, Douay. The *NIV* and Moffat do not clearly favor either alternative. P. RICHARDSON, *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (Cambridge 1969) 85, who favors this view offers the following rendering: “May God give peace to all who will walk according to this criterion, and mercy also to his faithful people”. This is ambiguous, however, so that both groups could still be understood to be identical.

(⁵) E.g., see M. SILVA, *Explorations in Exegetical Method: Galatians as a Test Case* (Grand Rapids 1996) 184.

(⁶) That 6,11-17 sums up the major themes of the epistle has been argued most trenchantly by J.A.D. WEIMA, “Gal 6,11-18: a Hermeneutical Key to the Galatian Letter”, *Calvin Theological Journal* 28 (1993) 90-107, and likewise id., “The Pauline Letter Closings: Analysis and Hermeneutical Significance”, *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 5 (1995) 177-198. Because of the summarizing nature of 6,11-18, Weima also identifies “the Israel of God” with the entire church of Galatia, both Christian Jew and Gentiles; so also C.A. RAY, “The Identity of the ‘Israel of God’”, *The Theological Educator* 50 [1994] 105-114, makes the same identification). H.D. BETZ, *Galatians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1979) 321, says “The whole argument in the letter leads up to the rule in v 15”. See also F.J. MATERA, “The Culmination of Paul’s Argument to the Galatians: Gal 5,1-6,17”, *JSNT* 32 (1988) 79-91, who argues that the last two chapters of Galatians summarize the earlier themes of the epistle and are the culmination of Paul’s overall argument.

It has been argued, however, that, since the common meaning for *καί* is “and” and since the word “Israel” elsewhere in the NT always refers to the ethnic nation, the burden of proof rests on one to show that *καί* is appositional and refers to both Gentile and Jewish Christians⁽⁷⁾. In response, C.A. Ray has applied to Gal 6,16 the linguistic rule for *καί* formulated by K. Titrud: though *καί* occurs many times in the NT with various meanings (approx. 9,000), instead of assuming that the most common meaning applies (which is “generally connective”), one should opt for that meaning “which contributes the least new information to the total context” (a principle sometimes referred to as “the rule of maximal redundancy”). In particular, Titrud maintained that, in view of the rule of maximal redundancy, if apposition is a viable option for *καί*, then it should be seriously considered⁽⁸⁾. This means that the overall

(7) E.g., S.L. JOHNSON, “Paul and the ‘Israel of God’: a Case Study”, *Essays in Honour of J. D. Pentecost* (eds. S.D. TOUSSAINT – C.H. DYER (Chicago 1986) 181-196. For others following a position similar to Johnson’s, see his own discussion and that of R.N. LONGENECKER, *Galatians* (WBC; Dallas 1990) 274. Johnson (188) even agrees with Ellicott’s contention that it is unlikely that Paul ever employs *καί* in “so marked an explicative sense”. A number of grammars, however, acknowledge the explicative or exegetical sense of *καί* as an explicit category of usage in the NT and Paul: e.g., BAGD even prefix their entry of the “explicative” *καί* (expressed as “and so, that is, namely”) with “often” (393, including the subcategory of “ascensive” [“even”]), citing Rom 1,5; 1 Cor 3,5, and 15,38 as among the Pauline examples (cf. also *ibid.* 392, *Id.*). Intriguingly, M. ZERWICK, *Biblical Greek* (Rome 1963) 154, cites apposition (“that is”) as an explicit category for *καί*, and then cites Gal 6,16 as the lone Pauline example (though followed by a question mark). Likewise, N. TURNER, *Syntax*. Vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by J. H. MOULTON (Edinburgh 1963) 334-335 (citing, among other examples, Rom 1,5 and 8,17); F. BLASS – A. DEBRUNNER – R.W. FUNK, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Chicago 1961) 229 (citing, e.g., 1 Cor 12,15; 15,38); A. BUTTMANN, *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek* (Andover 1873) 401 (citing 1 Cor 3,5; 15,38). Cf. also Rom 5,14. Approximately eighty times in the NT *καί* has the appositional meaning in the construction of *article + substantive + καί + substantive*, which is known as the Granville Sharp Rule (see D.B. WALLACE, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* [Grand Rapids 1996] 270-277). Even among the first descriptions of usage in LIDDELL-SCOTT (857) is the following: “to add a limiting or defining expression”. H.W. SMYTH, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, MA 1920) 650 (sect. 2869) says, “copulative *καί* often has an intensive or heightening force,” and “often = namely,” etc.

(8) See K. TITRUD, “The Function of *kai* in the Greek New Testament and an Application to 2 Peter”, *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation*. Essays on Discourse Analysis (ed. D.A. BLACK) (Nashville 1992) 240, 248,

context of Galatians must be considered in identifying "Israel". To identify "Israel" with only the ethnic nation would be introducing a new idea into the letter: whereas Paul has throughout underscored unity among redeemed Jews and Gentiles, it would seem, not only a new thought, but an odd notion to underscore at the end a blessing on Gentile and Jew separately⁽⁹⁾. Ultimately, immediate context must decide the meaning of the use of any word.

Some have proposed that the wording "peace and mercy be upon them and upon the Israel of God" is derived from an early Jewish benediction preserved in later Jewish tradition in the nineteenth benediction of the *Shemoneh 'Esreh* or one of the variant forms of that benediction: "Bring *peace*, goodness, and blessing, grace and favor and mercy over us and over all Israel, your people"⁽¹⁰⁾. The reference to "Peace be upon Israel" in the LXX of Pss 124,5 and 127,6 has also been proposed⁽¹¹⁾. Likewise, close to Gal 6,16 is Ezra 3,11: "it is good that his mercy is upon Israel forever"⁽¹²⁾. These are possible

255, who also shows throughout the essay numerous examples of the appositional καί in the NT.

(⁹) So RAY, "Identity of the 'the Israel of God'", 106 ff., whose conceptual analysis is good, though it may not be precisely accurate to refer to this particular case as an example of "the rule of maximal redundancy" in the light of the way the phrase was originally formulated in linguistic discussion (on which see M. SILVA, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning* [Grand Rapids 1983] 153-156); nevertheless, the principle of "the rule of maximal redundancy" appears to be generally applicable to Gal 6,16. See MATERA, *Galatians* 233, for a full range of the various possible identifications of "the Israel of God".

(¹⁰) So, e.g., BETZ, *Galatians* 321-322; RICHARDSON, *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, 79, who especially thinks that the order of "peace" and then "mercy," which is unique to Gal 6,16 and the *Shemoneh 'Esreh*, makes the latter a plausible source of dependence or "unconscious allusion". His conclusion that Paul interprets the Jewish benediction ironically, so that "the Israel of God" refers to ethnic Jews to be converted in the future is speculation, since such a notion has not been explicitly referred to anywhere else in Galatians. If Weima, along with others, is correct, that the Pauline conclusions, especially in Galatians 6, summarize the themes of the epistle (on which see above), then Richardson's futuristic notion should have been addressed explicitly earlier in the epistle.

(¹¹) E.g., MATERA, *Galatians* 226; J.G.D. DUNN, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Black's NTC; Peabody 1993) 344, also cites the parallels of 11QPs^a 23,11 ("Peace be upon Israel"?), Psalms of Solomon 9,19 and 11,9 ("The mercy of the Lord be upon Israel [or the house of Israel]?") and 17,51 ("May the Lord hasten his mercy upon Israel").

(¹²) So RICHARDSON, *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, 78, who also compares other similar OT texts such as Ezek 39,25; Amos 5,15, etc., as well as similar repeated expressions in the Psalms of Solomon.

backgrounds, but it would be hard to demonstrate the probability that the language in question in the Shemoneh 'Esreh existed in an earlier form as far back as the first century, since the Palestinian recension, which approximates the wording of the prayer around AD 70-100, omits about half of the wording of the later Babylonian recension's nineteenth benediction, including the crucial word "mercy"⁽¹³⁾! The Psalm references lack not only a reference to "mercy" but also do not have a double reference to the recipients, which the Shemoneh 'Esreh, at least, has. If the Shemoneh 'Esreh were in mind, then the καί in Gal 6,16 would most naturally be understood as appositional (*contra* to Richardson's above-mentioned analysis).

There may exist a better background than any of these preceding proposals which has closer similarities in both wording and contextual idea: a hitherto unnoticed OT background in Isaiah 54 appears to have more probability of standing behind the phrase "peace and mercy" than any other background previously proposed. If this is so, it would confirm the idea that the "Israel of God" is a reference to the entire church and not only the Jewish Christian segment of it (though the other proposed references would also have similar ramifications). The phrase "peace upon them and mercy" in Gal 6,16 is likely a further development of the use of Isa 54,1 in Gal 4,27. In Isa 54,10 God says to Israel "But my *lovingkindness* (חסד) will not be removed from you, and my covenant of *peace* (שלום) will not be shaken". The LXX renders the Hebrew חסד by ἔλεος ("mercy") and שלום by εἰρήνη, ("peace"). The only other times in which the two Hebrew words occur in such close connection (e.g., within an eight-word range)⁽¹⁴⁾ are Jer 16,5 and Ps 84,10, the former referring to God's removing of "lovingkindness" and "peace" when the nation goes into captivity, and the latter alluding to the return of these two aspects of divine favor when God restores the nation

(¹³) For debate about the prayer's antiquity, see RICHARDSON, *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, 79, n. 1, and see especially E. SCHÜRER, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Christ*, II, (eds. G. VERMES – F. MILLAR – M. BLACK) (Edinburgh 1979) 455-463, who also has a convenient list of quotations of the Babylonian and Palestinian benedictions, along with relevant bibliography on the nature and date of the prayer. In particular, Schürer contends that the core of the nineteen parts of the prayer goes back before the first century A.D., and that it reached its final form around 70-100 A.D., though even that cannot be reconstructed in detail.

(¹⁴) Indeed, there are no other examples of the combination even within a twenty-five word range.

from exile: “*Lovingkindness* and truth have met together, and righteousness and *peace* have kissed each other” (Ps 84,10).

Outside of Isa 54,10 ἔλεος (“mercy”) and εἰρήνη, (“peace”) occur in close combination (within a seven-word range) in the LXX only in Ps 84,11 (= MT 85,11)⁽¹⁵⁾ and Tobit 7,12 (the latter occurring in only one version of the LXX in an insignificant context which refers to a personal wish of blessing bestowed on one person to another)⁽¹⁶⁾. Outside of these passages, the combination does not occur elsewhere (in an eight-word range) until the use in Galatians and in subsequent early Christian literature of the early church fathers⁽¹⁷⁾. This evidence shows that the combination of “mercy and peace” was *not* a typical part of formulaic benedictions in early Judaism nor a part of typical conclusions in early Hellenistic epistolary literature.

The occurrence in the LXX of Ps 84,11 is a literal rendering of the Hebrew given above, yet the combination of ἔλεος and εἰρήνη also occurs only two verses earlier in vv. 8-9 in almost the same close proximity: “Show us your *mercy* (ἔλεος) and give to us your salvation. Hear what the Lord God will speak through me: he will speak *peace* (εἰρήνη) upon his people and upon his saints, and upon those who turn their heart toward him”. Interestingly, the promised condition of the peace and mercy of restoration is also referred to as an “enlivening” (“you will turn and *you will enliven* [ζωώσεις]

⁽¹⁵⁾ After writing the rough draft of this article, I found that DUNN, *Galatians*, 344, merely lists Isa 54,10 and Ps 85,11 among a number of other texts which he believes would have highlighted the *Jewish tone* of the benediction in the ears of the Jewish Christian audience.

⁽¹⁶⁾ The Tobit reference could be an echo of Isa 54,10 since Isa 54,11-12 is alluded to in 13,16-17. The combination also occurs within a wider twenty-five word range in Odes of Sol 9,78-79; Sirach 50,22-24; Isa 45,7-8, all in contexts of a promise of restoration from exile; other combinations within the same range occur in insignificant contexts of personal blessing in 1 Sam 20,7-8.13-14, and 1 Kgs 2,6-7. The Syriac of 2 Baruch 78,2 reads “to the brethren carried into captivity: ‘Mercy and peace’”. PHILO, *On Dreams*, II.149, has the combination within a close word-range: “supplicate God that He ... charge His saving *mercy* to remain with us to the end, for it is a grievous thing that when we have tasted *peace* in its purity we should be hindered from taking our fill of it” (following the Loeb translation).

⁽¹⁷⁾ The searches noted in this paragraph and the preceding one were made on the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Data Bank* computer concordance. Two other occurrences outside the LXX appear also to be found in the Hebrew of Qumran and the Latin of Jubilees, on which see below.

us," v. 7). Furthermore, the attributes surrounding "mercy" and "peace" in Ps 84,11 ("faithfulness" and "righteousness") are portrayed in the directly following verses as fruits of God's eschatological creative work in combination with other fertility imagery: "Faithfulness springs from the earth ... and our land will yield its produce" (vv. 12-13).

The Psalm has some significant affinities with the Galatians context: (1) "mercy" and "peace" are pronounced "upon" Israel (cf. εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν in Ps 84,9 and εἰρήνη ἐπ' αὐτούς in Gal 6,16); (2) the notion of new "life" is associated with the salvific state of God's people (cf. Ps 84,7 [above] and Gal 5,25); (3) the pronouncement of "peace" in Ps 84,9 is made to three groups; however, these are, in fact, different ways of referring to one group, Israel ("peace upon [ἐπὶ] his people and upon [ἐπὶ] his saints and upon [ἐπὶ] the ones who turn their heart to him"); likewise in Gal 6,16 peace is pronounced on multiple groups (with two ἐπὶ clauses), and, if this is any reflection of the Psalm, the two groups there are probably the same; (4) in both contexts "peace" is listed among other attributes which are part of eschatological fertility imagery (cf. Gal 5,22-25).

It is possible that the uses in Jeremiah and, especially Psalm 84, together with the use in Isaiah 54 are alluded to collectively in Gal 6,16, since they all refer to the peace and mercy Israel would experience in the promised restoration (though Jeremiah says it negatively), and Paul has clearly had the fulfillment of Israel's promised restoration in mind with the explicit Isa 54,1 quotation in Galatians 4. Since these are the only three times where the combined uses appear in the Hebrew OT and since they all have the same reference (the divine blessing of peace and mercy upon Israel in the coming restoration), it is understandable that they may have become a collective influence (especially the Greek uses in the LXX) on Paul.

If any one of these combined uses of "peace" and "mercy" are uppermost in mind in Gal, 6,16, it would have to be Isa 54,10 for the following reasons: (1) Isa 54,1 has already been referred to in Gal 4,27; thus, Paul already had the Isaiah 54 context explicitly in mind⁽¹⁸⁾; (2) συστοιχέω directly precedes the reference to Isaiah 54

(18) The Targum adds to the MT by identifying the barren woman of Isa 54,1 twice as "Jerusalem," and then the next time it adds "Jerusalem" is in 54,10, where the name also identifies the "you" who is promised "peace" and "mercy". Could this have been a subtle influence upon Paul in alluding to Isa

in Gal 4,25-27, and στοιχέω likewise directly precedes “peace and mercy” in Gal 6,15-16 (and the two words overlap semantically); (3) the “peace” and “mercy” of Isa 54,10 is seen in vv. 11-12 to have its concrete expression in the coming conditions of new creation at the time of Israel’s restoration: “I will set your stones in antimony, and your foundations I will lay in sapphires. Moreover, I will make your battlements of rubies, and your gates of crystal, and your entire wall of precious stones” (this is consistent with Isaiah 54 in that God is the one who is “making” Israel again [54,5] and who “has created” her in order that she be restored [54,16]⁽¹⁹⁾). In fact, Isa 54,9 compares the coming state of restoration to the conditions directly following Noah’s flood, which is associated with new creation motifs in Genesis⁽²⁰⁾ and which some sectors of Jewish tradition termed a new creation⁽²¹⁾. Then Isa 54,10a portrays the cosmic dissolution which must precede the coming new creation: “the mountains may be removed and the hills may shake”. All of this material in Isaiah 54 is part of a larger pattern of new creation prophecies in Isaiah 40–66 which refers to the restoration of Israel as a *new creation*⁽²²⁾.

II. Qumran, Jubilees and Revelation 21

In this connection, Qumran also uses a phrase strikingly close to Isa 54,10 to introduce a discussion about the coming new creation,

54,10 in further development of the Isa 54,1 quotation in Galatians 4,27, which is introduced in 4,26 by the phrase “the Jerusalem above is free”?

⁽¹⁹⁾ Cf. ποιέω and κτίζω respectively. These references in Isaiah 54 anticipate Isa 65,17 which refers to “a new heaven and a new earth,” which is elaborated upon in 65,18 with “I am making *Jerusalem* a rejoicing”.

⁽²⁰⁾ For various aspects of the Noah narrative (Genesis 6–9) as recapitulations of the Adam narrative, see, e.g. W.A. GAGE, *The Gospel of Genesis. Studies in Protology and Eschatology* (Winona Lake 1984) 8-16.

⁽²¹⁾ E.g., PHILO, *Life of Moses* II, 65, uses the word παλιγγενεσία (“regeneration, rebirth”) in referring to the renewal of the earth after the cataclysmic flood; likewise Jub 5,12 (immediately after the Noachic deluge, God “made for all his works a new and righteous nature so that they might not sin in their nature forever”) and 1 En 106,13 (“The Lord will surely make new things upon the earth”).

⁽²²⁾ On which see G.K. BEALE, “The Old Testament Background of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5-7 and Its Bearing on the Literary Problem of 2 Cor. 6:14-7:1”, *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989) 550-581; id., “The Old Testament Background of Rev 3.14”, *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996) 133-152.

a phrase which is based on the new creation prophecies of Isa 43,19 and 48,6-7: cf. “eternal *mercy* [חסד] unto all [brief lacuna] for *peace* [שלום]” (1QH 13,5 [=5,11])⁽²³⁾ with “[by bringing to an end the] former [things] and by creating things that are new, by setting aside the former covenants and by [set]ting up that which shall remain for ever” (1QH 13,11-12 [following the Dupont-Sommer edition in lines 11-12]; the discussion of new creation actually begins in 13,8)⁽²⁴⁾. In addition, this example is the only place in Qumran where the two words occur in such close connection as two separate qualities to be bestowed upon saints⁽²⁵⁾! Noticeably, the DSS passage has in common with Isaiah 54 and Gal 6,15-16 (cf. 4,24-27) the mention of a “covenant” (cf. 1QH 13,12), and both Galatians and 1QH have in mind the annulment of the old covenant and the establishment of a new covenant⁽²⁶⁾.

(23) The full phrase in Hebrew reads, חסדי עולם לכול [] לשלום. This phrase is rendered differently by various DSS editions: “and eternal mercy to all [who walk] in peace” (M. WISE – M. ABEGG – E. COOK, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* [San Francisco 1996] 87); “and everlasting favor for all [the periods] of peace” (F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* [Leiden 1992] 319); “and eternal grace unto all the peace-[makers]” (A. DUPONT-SOMMER, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* [Oxford 1961] 242). It is difficult to know what to supply in the lacuna: in addition to the above, other options could be such words as “[leading] to peace,” “[making] for peace,” etc.

(24) *Pirke de Rabbi Eli'ezer* XIX cites Isa 54,10 at the end of a discussion on God's creation of the world (which repeatedly cites Gen 1 and Isa 48,13) in order to underscore that without God's “mercy and lovingkindness we [Israel] are unable to exist, because the world rests upon Thy mercy and lovingkindness, as it is said ... [quotation of Isa 54,10 follows]”.

(25) As far as I have found, the only other place in DSS where the two words occur together is in 1QS 2,4, where the following blessing is pronounced upon Qumran saints: “May he lift up *his merciful* [חסדיו] countenance toward you for eternal peace [שלום]”. Here, only “peace” is pronounced on people, not “mercy,” the latter of which is described as an attribute possessed by God and not by the people. Furthermore, the context of 1QS 2 has nothing to do with new creation.

(26) Similar to Gal 5,22–6,16, 1QH 13 also has a contrast between “the spirit of flesh” (associated with the ungodly qualities of “ignominious shame,” “perverseness,” and “ungodliness”) and “the Spirit which you have put in me” (associated with “truth” and “righteousness;” cf. 1QH 13,13-19). Furthermore, both 1QH 13,5 and Isa 54,8 have the phrase “everlasting mercy” (חסד עולם), a similarity which shows further affinities between the two, though the phrase often occurs elsewhere, especially in the Psalms (e.g., 26 times in Psalm 136 alone).

The combination of “peace” and “mercy” also occurs in Jubilees 22,9 (extant Latin), where Abraham invokes God’s blessing on himself and his posterity: “may your mercy [*misericordia*] and your peace [*pax*]⁽²⁷⁾ be upon your servant and upon the seed of his sons so that they may become an elect people for you and an inheritance from all the nations of the earth from henceforth and for all the days of the generations of the earth forever” (Charlesworth edition). This may be significant in comparison to the above uses in Qumran, Isaiah 54, and Galatians 6, since God is being addressed only in his role as creator who “created the heavens and the earth” (22,6), and the objects of God’s blessing especially are Abraham’s believing (elect) “seed”, who will dwell in a state of blessing on the earth forever (on which see further 22,24!). In particular, Jubilees 22, 1 QH 13,5, Isaiah 54, and Galatians 6 all have in common notions of: (1) new creation; (2) a new covenant (cf. “renew his covenant” in Jub 22,15 and 22,30; Isa 54,10; Gal 4,24), and (3) a promise of blessing on believing (elect) Israel. In addition, like Jubilees, the Isaiah and Galatians texts also are developing earlier references to the promises about the Abrahamic “seed” (cf. Isa 51,1-3 and 54,1-3; Gal 3,6-18.29). The notion of new creation in Jubilees 22 may well be a reflection on the similar Isaianic concept⁽²⁸⁾. In the light

(27) I am grateful to my research student Jeffrey Herron for pointing out the combination of these two words in this passage. The Vulgate also renders εἰρήνη and ἔλεος of Gal 6,16 respectively as *pax* and *misericordia*, and has the same two words in its translation of Isa 54,10b. It is difficult to be certain what precise words stood in the original Hebrew *Vorlage* and the subsequent Greek translation of the Jubilees’ text.

(28) In Jub 22,13 Abraham prays that his seed would have the same new creation blessings “with which he [God] blessed Noah and Adam”, so that the comparison of the blessing on Noah with the blessing on restored Israel in Isa 54,9 also is a striking similarity. Further, that the “seed” is to be blessed “for all the days of the generations of the earth forever” likely includes the blessings of the eternal, new creation, which develops the notion in earlier chapters: e.g., Jub 1,29 reads, “the new creation when the heaven and earth and all of their creatures shall be renewed ... and all of the lights will be renewed for ... blessing all of the elect of Israel ... *from that day and unto all the days of the earth*”; similarly, in Jub 19,25 the seed of Abraham and Jacob will be blessed so that “they will serve to establish heaven and to strengthen the earth and to renew all of the lights which are above the firmament”. Jub 1,29 is likely an allusion to Isa 65,17 and 66,22 (so cf. the margin of Charlesworth’s edition) and Jub 19,25 echoes the earlier use (the “new creation” of Jub 4,26 is also likely an echo of Isa 43,18-19 or Isaiah 65 and 66). Other texts from Isaiah hover in the nearby context of Jub 22,9: cf. 21,25, “may he bless your seed ... for eternal

of these observations, Jub 22,9 may be an echo of Isa 54,10, or it may have been part of the same orbit of unique ideas, which formed part of the background for Galatians 6.

It has become clear that the “peace” and “mercy” of Isa 54,10b stands in the middle of a depiction of the future new creation. That Isa 54,11-12 describes conditions of a new creation is apparent further from the fact that these verses are alluded to in Rev 21,18-19.21 to describe the bejewelled “foundation stones of the city wall”, part of the portrayal there of the “new heaven and a new earth” (Rev 21,1)⁽²⁹⁾. Indeed, Revelation 21 and Galatians 4,25-31/6,15-16 have the following significant themes in common:

(1) The image of end-time Jerusalem as a woman who is associated with heaven;

(2) the precious stones of the city in Isaiah 54 are portrayed as part of an immovable fortress (in contrast to Israel formerly being “storm-tossed”) and primarily used as a metaphor for the permanent peace which the people inhabiting the latter-day Jerusalem will experience, since 54,11-12 is introduced in 54,10b by the idea of “peace” and concluded with it in 54,13 (“the peace of your sons will be great”). This theme is found in both Gal 6,16 and Revelation 21: in line with Isa 54,11-12, the precious stones, together with the foundation, wall, and gates of the city in Revelation 21 are best seen to symbolize the permanent safety and peace⁽³⁰⁾ of God’s people together with God’s glorious presence (e.g., 21,2-4.10-11.18-23).

generations with all righteous blessing ... so that you might be a blessing in all the earth”, which appears to derive from Isa 65,16 (where also there is a multiple “blessing” by God focused on Israel “in the earth” of the eschatological age, the only passage in the OT where such a complex of words and ideas occurs); cf. Jub 22,16, probably based on Isa 52,11 (so cf. the margin of the Charlesworth edition). Intriguingly, in Isa 19,24-25 there is a threefold blessing pronounced on Israel, as well as redeemed Egypt and Assyria, in the end-time period of salvation, and all three are said to be “a blessing in the midst of the earth”. Both Isa 65,16 and Isa 19,24-25 are plausibly developments of the repeated Abrahamic promise in which dual blessings are pronounced on Abraham’s seed and the nations (Gen 12,2-3; 17,16; 22,17; 27,33; 48,20; cf. also 1 Chr 17,27 for a triple blessing on David’s seed, which is also a development of the Abrahamic promise).

⁽²⁹⁾ On which see G.K. BEALE, *Revelation* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids – Carlisle 1998) *ad loc.*

⁽³⁰⁾ Some traditions held that the light reflected by the gems in Isa 54,11-12 was figurative for peace (Pesiqta de Rab Kahana, Piska 18,6; Pesik. Rab., Piska 32,3/4).

(3) Both Galatians and Revelation 21 focus on the Gentiles' being included in the redemption experienced by eschatological Israel (note the "nations" streaming into the city of Revelation 21 [cf. vv. 24.26])⁽³¹⁾. This idea may even have roots in the Greek version of Isa 54,3 itself⁽³²⁾, especially since Isa 54,1 develops reference to the Abrahamic promise in Isa 51,2, which in that context is used as a reason for God's restoring of Israel, i.e., Israel's restoration will be part of the fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise: "Look to Abraham our father, and to Sarah who gave birth to you in pain; when he was one I called him, Then I blessed him and multiplied him"⁽³³⁾. The LXX of Isaiah 54 makes such intimations explicit: "For it is the Lord who is making you; the Lord of hosts is his name; and the one redeeming you, he himself is the God of Israel, *and he will be called so by the whole earth*" (Isa 54,5); "behold proselytes will come to you through me, and they will sojourn with you, and they will run to you for refuge" (Isa 54,15)⁽³⁴⁾. Even according to the LXX interpretative translation, however, the believing Gentiles enjoy eschatological blessings only as they confess and identify with the "God of *Israel*" and only as they

(31) Tob 13,16-18 specifically speaks of rebuilding the walls, towers, gates and streets, a description which is similar to the mention of foundations, battlements, gates and wall in Isa 54,11-12. Tobit is probably developing Isaiah 54 in the light of the broader Isaiah context: e.g., note Tob 13,10 (11) (AB), "that his tabernacle may be built" (= Isa 56,5.7; 60,7.13) and Tob 13,11 (Alex.), "*many nations will come from far ... with gifts in their hands*" (= Isa 49,23; 60,3.5.9-11.16-17). Both Tobit and Rev 21,18-21 have this common imagery and themes, including the ideas of *the nations bearing gifts* (21,24.26, based on the same Isaiah texts) and the future rebuilding of the tabernacle (21,3.22). In addition, both refer to "Jerusalem, the holy city" (Tob 13,9 [10]; Rev 21,2, 10; note further the phrase *λίθω ἐντίμω* which occurs with *χρυσίω καθαρόω* in Tob 13,16 (17) (AB) and essentially the same phrases occur in Rev 21,18-19.21, as well as the common elements of walls and streets).

(32) "Your seed will possess [LXX has "inherit"] the nations" (cf. Amos 9,12 where the prophecy that Israel will "possess the remnant of Edom and all the nations" is understood by Acts 15,15-18 as fulfilled in the salvation of the Gentiles (though the textual problems in the Amos text are complex).

(33) In this light, the "seed" in Isa 54,3 is probably an allusion to the "seed" of the Abrahamic promise.

(34) Here God's promise in the MT to protect Israel from Gentile enemies and to give them victory over the enemies is apparently interpreted by the LXX as God's causing Gentiles to seek refuge in Israel and her faith! This interpretation is strikingly similar to the one of Amos 9,11-12 by the LXX and Acts 15,15-18 (mentioned directly above).

identify with his people Israel by converting and becoming “proselytes” to the faith of Israel. From the Septuagintal translator’s perspective, the Gentiles cannot enjoy these blessings separately from Israel but only by becoming a part of national, theocratic Israel. Paul also likely does not see that Gentiles can enjoy end-time blessings separately from Jews because the only way that either can participate in such blessing is by identifying with Christ, the true Israel, the true “seed of Abraham” (Gal 3,16.29). Gentiles no longer need to move to geographical Israel and find “refuge” there in order to convert to the faith of that theocratic nation and they no longer need to adopt the national signs of Israel (e.g., circumcision) to be considered true Israelites. Rather, now, in the new redemptive-historical epoch launched by Christ’s death and resurrection, Gentiles merely need to move spiritually to Christ, find “refuge” in him, and convert to faith in him in order to become true Israelites.

In view of the associations of new creation which have been “ringing around” Isa 54,10 and the way Revelation 21 understands Isaiah 54 as a new creation text, it should not be surprising that Paul would find it natural to allude to Isaiah’s “peace and mercy” in Gal 6,16 as a part of the “new creation” which he has just explicitly mentioned in v. 15.

A further affinity between Isaiah 54 and Gal 4,24-27/6,16 lies in the fact that both explicitly mention the *covenantal* nature of the salvific restoration (cf. Isa 54,10, “covenant of your peace,” and Gal 4,24.27, “these [women] are two covenants [v. 24] ... the Jerusalem above is free; she is our mother”). That Paul would have a new creation context from Isaiah in mind in Gal 6,15-16 is not unexpected, since he clearly refers to the new creation prophecies of Isa 43,19 and Isa 65,17 in 2 Cor 5,17, where he also refers to *καινή κτίσις*: “if anyone is in Christ, then there is a *new creation*; the old things have passed away, behold new things have come about”. Likewise, the similar expression of Christ as “the beginning of the [new] creation of God” (ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ) in Rev 3,14 is also heavily indebted to the same Isaiah 43 and 65 texts⁽³⁵⁾.

⁽³⁵⁾ On the 2 Cor 5,17 and Rev 3,14 texts see BEALE, “Old Testament Background of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5-7”, and id., “Old Testament Background of Rev 3,14”.

Isa 54,10 was a prophecy about the “peace” and “mercy” *Israel* would have in the coming new order after their restoration⁽³⁶⁾. If Paul has this verse in mind in Gal 6,16, then he sees *all* believers in the Galatian church who experience “peace” and “mercy” to be composing end-time Israel in partial fulfillment of Isa 54,11. Such an Old Testament background makes it unlikely that he sees two separate ethnic groups (respectively Christian Gentile and Jew) as having “peace and mercy” pronounced upon them; at the least, in view of the OT and Galatians’ context, the burden of proof is on one to demonstrate that “the Israel of God” is a reference only to ethnic Jewish Christians.

This line of argumentation confirms further that the sense of Gal 6,16b is that of “peace and mercy be upon them, *that is*, upon the Israel of God” or some such similar rendering which equates the “them” with the “Israel of God”⁽³⁷⁾. Redeemed Gentiles now form true Israel, “Abraham’s seed” (Gal 3,29) together with Jewish Christians because they are identified with and represented by the individual “seed of Abraham,” Christ, who sums up Israel in himself (Gal 3,16)⁽³⁸⁾. Consequently, Paul did not consider it “twisting” the prophetic meaning of Isaiah 54 to apply it to Gentile believers, since they are now viewed as true Israelites and their return to God is part of the fulfillment of the restoration and new creation promise made to *Israel*. Even in the LXX interpretative paraphrase of Isaiah 54 noted above, the salvation of Gentiles could not occur separately from that of Jews but was to happen as Gentiles were to become identified with Israel’s God and Israel

⁽³⁶⁾ The reference to “*all Israel* like antimony” at the beginning of the Qumran peshier of Isa 54,11 underscores what is clear throughout Isaiah 54 but not said explicitly in v. 10 or v. 11: that this was a prophecy for *Israel*, with the implication, therefore, that it was not a prophecy for the redeemed nations *except* as they identify with Israel, convert to Israel’s faith, and take refuge under the umbrella of Israel and Israel’s God.

⁽³⁷⁾ The three appositional groups (equaling believing Israel) in Ps 84,9 upon which the peace is pronounced would further confirm this identification. The solution of R.Y.K. FUNG, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1988) 311, also fits with the view developed here: that, as far as I understand him, the first group (“them”) refers to Jewish and Gentile Christians in the Galatian church and the following “Israel of God” alludes to the church at large, also composed of Gentiles and Jews, who are the new Israel.

⁽³⁸⁾ See BEALE, *Book of Revelation*, *ad loc* at Rev 7,9, for the possible ways Gentiles could be understood to be part of the fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise from Genesis.

herself. Paul understands that this Isaiah prophecy began fulfillment in Christ: Gentiles and Jews participate in the blessings promised to Israel in the eschaton by identifying with Jesus, the true Israel and true seed of Abraham.

In summary, the probability of an Isaiah 54 background for Gal 6,16 is validated by the following criteria for recognizing allusions⁽³⁹⁾: (1) the source text (the Greek or Hebrew OT) must be available to the writer; (2) there is close resemblance of wording; (3) there are references in the immediate context to the same OT context from which the purported allusion derives. In this respect, the following echoes from the context of Isaiah 54 are found elsewhere in Galatians: Isa 53,1 in Gal 3,2; Isa 64,10 in Gal 3,10; Isa 44,1-3 and 54,21 in Gal 4,4-6; Isa 54,1 and 66,6-11 in Gal 4,25-26; the Spirit's fruits of Isa 32,15-18 (as well as Isa 27,6; 37,31-32; 45,8; 51,3; 58,11; cf. 55,10-13 with 56,3; 60,21; 65,8.17-22) in Gal 5,22-25. In addition, Paul alludes to Isaiah 43 and 65 in his other well-known reference to the "new creation" in 2 Cor 5,17, contexts which are not far from Isaiah 54 in location and pertain to the same theme of Israel's restoration pictured as a new cosmos. John alludes to the same texts for the same idea of new creation in Rev 3,14, and specifically alludes repeatedly to Isaiah 54 in his depiction of the new creation in Revelation 21. (4) The alleged OT allusion is suitable in that it fits into Paul's argument. Isaiah 40-66 contains the same major themes which Paul develops in Galatians: the Abrahamic covenant, Abraham's seed, the inheritance⁽⁴⁰⁾, the return of a sinful people to God, and the new creation. (5) There is plausibility that Paul could have intended such an allusion and that the audience could have understood it. Jobes has argued that it is plausible that Paul taught the Galatians from the Greek of Isaiah and that his citation of Isaiah 54 in Galatians 4 is intended to remind the audience of that prior teaching⁽⁴¹⁾. If so, the same could be said

⁽³⁹⁾ These criteria are taken partly from R.B. HAYS, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven 1989) 29-32, and G.K. BEALE, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham 1985) 43, 306-312.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ K. JOBES, "Jerusalem, our Mother: Metalepsis and Intertextuality in Galatians 4.21-31", *WTJ* 55 (1993) 319, mentions the first of these three themes in her discussion of Isaiah 54 in Galatians 3, as well as noting most of the parallels from Isaiah in Galatians in # (3) above.

⁽⁴¹⁾ *Ibid.*, 319.

about the proposed allusion to “peace and mercy” in Gal 6,16, but since it is an allusion and not an explicit citation as in Gal 4,27, it is more difficult to know if the readers would have understood it as such on a first reading or hearing⁽⁴²⁾.

In proposing a Targumic background linked to the Isaiah 54 quotation in Galatians 4, M. McNamara says that it is unlikely Paul’s readers would have understood the reference there. He concludes, however, that this fact would not weaken the force of his proposal “since, at times, particularly in moments of heightened tension, Paul seems to have written from the abundance of his own mind rather than from what his readers would be expected to know”⁽⁴³⁾. Longenecker adds that the Hagar-Sarah story may have been referred to by Paul as a polemic against the Judaizer’s understanding of the story with which the readers may have been familiar⁽⁴⁴⁾. If so, his quotation of Isaiah 54 in Galatians 4 may have been sparked off because that OT verse and context had also been part of the Judaizer’s hermeneutical arsenal.

The cumulative effect of considering all five of the above criteria for validating allusions suggests the plausibility that the allusion to Isa 54,10 in Gal 6,16 may not have been understood by the Galatians on a first or second reading but that, at least, it may well have been in Paul’s mind.

III. Peace Benedictions

Paul’s closing benedictions of peace elsewhere outside of Galatians follow a fairly standard form: “the God of peace be (or will be) with you (Rom 15,33; 2 Cor 13,11b; Phil 4,9b). 2 Thess 3,16 varies only slightly from this pattern, and Rom 16,20a and 1 Thess 5,23 vary even a bit more⁽⁴⁵⁾. The benediction of Gal 6,16

(42) For further discussion of the issues involved in answering this question with respect to allusions, see G.K. BEALE, *John’s Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* (JSNTSS 163; Sheffield 1999) 62-75.

(43) MCNAMARA, “‘to de (Hagar) Sina oros estin en tē Arabia’ (Gal 4,25): Paul and Petra”, *Milltown Studies* 2 (1978) 24-41.

(44) LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, 212.

(45) Romans 16,20 places, after the clause “the God of peace”, the phrase “will trample Satan under your feet quickly”, and 1 Thess 5,23, after the same clause, puts the even more amplified phrase “sanctify you entirely, and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved complete, blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ”.

differs the most; its uniqueness among all the others can be observed by the following differences: (1) it has no introductory clause “and the God of peace”; (2) εἰρήνη, (“peace”) is expressed by the nominative instead of the genitive; (3) ἔλεος (“mercy”) is added to “peace”; (4) the divine source (God) of the peace is omitted; (5) the identification of the recipients is also different: instead of the usual “with you”, Gal 6,16 reads “as many as line up with this rule” and “upon them ... and upon the Israel of God”; (6) finally, it is a conditional benediction, whereas the others are in the indicative⁽⁴⁶⁾.

What explains these differences between Galatians and the other benedictions? Weima contends that the differences in 1 Thessalonians and Galatians are due to Paul’s attempt to summarize the major themes of those two epistles, and that the other benedictions likely also betray the same purpose⁽⁴⁷⁾. This explanation is plausible, especially in Galatians, as we have seen above. Such an intention is further evident from noticing that στοιχέω is a development of 4,25 and 5,25. Συστοιχέω in 4,25 occurs as an introduction to the longest formal Old Testament quotation found in the epistle - from Isaiah 54, which we have just contended above is also being alluded to in the benediction; στοιχέω in 5,25 appears in one of the most highly charged new-creation texts anywhere else in the letter outside of 6,15-16. Also, “Israel” occurs here only in the epistle and may well be a development of the “Jerusalem above” in 4,26, where it is the only reference to “Jerusalem” in a positive redemptive sense in the entire letter (the other occurrences are neutral geographical references [1,17-18; 2,1] or have negative spiritual overtones [4,25]). Such a positive reference to Jerusalem in Gal 4,26 may have helped pave the way for the unique positive reference to “Israel” in 6,16.

The combination of ἔλεος and εἰρήνη occurs only four other places in the NT, each time as part of the introduction to letters and each time as part of a threefold salutation: χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη (1

⁽⁴⁶⁾ For these differences see WEIMA, “The Pauline Letter Closings”, 194-195. With respect to the sixth point, though the future active indicative στοιχήσουσιν is used in Gal 6,16, it is still part of a sentence which has a conditional sense, since the distinction between the future indicative without ἄν and the aorist subjunctive with ἄν was sometimes obliterated (so F. BLASS, A. DEBRUNNER, and R.W. FUNK, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, 192; interestingly, P⁴⁶ changed the future to an aorist subjunctive).

⁽⁴⁷⁾ WEIMA, “The Pauline Letter Closings”.

Tim 1,1; 2 Tim 1,1; 2 Jn 3; Jude 2; though Jude has ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη). Not only is Gal 6,16 not part of a threefold series of words, but also εἰρήνη precedes ἔλεος, and the phrase ἐπ' αὐτοὺς is placed between the two words, a structure which is without analogy in the above four introductions. Another difference is that these others are standardized introductions, whereas Gal 6,16 is part of an epistolary conclusion which does not appear to be formulaic wording. There appears, at first glance, to be no particular OT allusion in these other passages. Whatever the bearing of these epistolary introductions is on Gal 6,17, it is clear that the Galatians' wording preceded all the others and is an earlier composition. If there is any relationship, then we could possibly conceive of the introductions having become standardized formulae based on that of Gal 6,16 together with Isaiah 54 and Psalm 84 and, possibly, other similar early Jewish combinations of "peace and mercy" (on which see above: e.g., Tobit 7, etc.).

Especially striking is the observation that not once does the combination "mercy and peace" appear in either the introductions or conclusions of Hellenistic epistolary literature of the earlier or contemporary period with the NT (e.g., in the body of extant papyrus letters [cf. the Hunt and Edgar volume of *Select Papyri I* in the Loeb edition]). This combination is unique to the OT, a very few early Jewish texts, and the NT⁽⁴⁸⁾. This fact enhances the possibility that Galatians is dependent on the earlier OT uses (especially Isaiah 54) and that the subsequent uses in epistolary introductions in the NT after Galatians are also based on the OT, early Jewish, and Galatians' usage.

IV. Galatians 6,17 with relationship to the preceding context

Since "peace" should reign in the new creation (v. 16b), Paul asks that "no one [apparently no so-called brother] cause trouble for me". He explicitly says this *because* (γὰρ) he bears on his "body the brand-marks of Christ". Those who belong to the old age insist on "making a good showing in the flesh" by being identified with the mark of "circumcision" in which they "boast" (v. 13). Since Paul, on the other hand, wants to "boast" only "in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ"

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Even subsequently, the combination is found only in later patristic literature of the second and third century.

through which he has been “crucified to the world” and since circumcision means nothing anymore (v. 15), Paul wants to be identified with the only mark of the new creation that there is, which is Messiah Jesus himself. Therefore, Paul’s statement in v. 17 that he “bears on his body the brand-marks of Jesus” is another way of saying that he does not want to be identified by the badge of the old creation (circumcision) but wants to be identified with the only sign of the new creation: with Jesus, and his suffering at the cross⁽⁴⁹⁾.

* * *

This essay has contended that Paul’s reference to “new creation” and the pronouncement of “peace and mercy” on the readers in Gal 6,15-16 is best understood against the background of Isa 54,10 and the surrounding context of similar new creation themes elsewhere in Isaiah 32–66, which are echoed also earlier in Galatians, especially in 5,22-26. The analysis confirms those prior studies which have concluded that “the Israel of God” refers to all Christians in Galatia, whether Jewish or Christian. Lastly, the demonstration of an Isaianic background for the concept of new creation in Gal 6,15-16 falls in line with Paul’s other reference to “new creation” in 2 Cor 5,17 and John’s allusion to new creation in Rev 3,14, where Isaiah 43 and 65–66 stand behind both passages⁽⁵⁰⁾. Isa 54,10 was likely not the sole influence on Gal 6,16, but such texts as Psalm 84 (LXX), the Qumran Hymn Scroll (1QH 13,5), and Jub 22,9 may have formed a collective impression on Paul, with the Isaiah text most in focus; alternatively, the texts in Qumran and Jubilees may

⁽⁴⁹⁾ This point is different from that made by many commentators, who usually appeal to the use of *στίγμα* as a brand or tattoo mark on slaves to show who their owner was (e.g., see LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, 299-300). If overtones of such a meaning are in mind, they have been shaped by the idea of identification with the new creation discussed here. DUNN, *Galatians*, 347, comes close to my own conclusion, but he does not relate his view of v. 17 to the old and new creation: “Paul ... sets in contrast an identity defined in terms of circumcision and one focused in the cross of Christ”. Likewise, D. GUTHRIE, *Galatians* (NCC; Camden, NJ 1969) 163; F.F. BRUCE, *Commentary on Galatians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids 1982) 275-276 (also citing 2 Cor 4,11 in support), and T. GEORGE, *Galatians* (NAC; Nashville 1994) 442; FUNG, *Galatians*, 314.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ As argued by BEALE, “The Old Testament Background of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5-7”, and id., “The Old Testament Background of Rev 3,14”.

be mere examples of a similar use of Isaiah 54 on a parallel trajectory with that of Paul's in Galatians 6.

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
130 Essex Street
South Hamilton, MA 10982 USA

G.K. BEALE

SUMMARY

This essay has contended that Paul's reference to "new creation" and the pronouncement of "peace and mercy" on the readers in Gal 6,15-16 is best understood against the background of Isa 54,10 and the surrounding context of similar new creation themes elsewhere in Isa 32-66, which are echoed also earlier in Galatians, especially in 5,22-26. The analysis confirms those prior studies which have concluded that "the Israel of God" refers to all Christians in Galatia, whether Jewish or Christian. Lastly, the demonstration of an Isaianic background for the concept of new creation in Gal 6,15-16 falls in line with Paul's other reference to "new creation" in 2 Cor 5,17 and John's allusion to new creation in Rev 3,14, where Isa 43 and 65-66 stand behind both passages. Isa 54,10 was likely not the sole influence on Gal 6,16, but such texts as Psalm 84 (LXX), the Qumran Hymn Scroll (1QH 13,5), and Jub 22,9 may have formed a collective impression on Paul, with the Isaiah text most in focus; alternatively, the texts in Qumran and Jubilees may be mere examples of a similar use of Isaiah 54 on a parallel trajectory with that of Paul's in Galatians 6.

The Sabbatical/Jubilee Cycle and the Seven-Year Famine in Egypt

With the approach of the millennium it seems appropriate to look at an institution, the Year of Jubilee, that, despite confounding interpreters as to its original meaning, has never ceased to capture the imagination of religious thinkers and political reformers down through the centuries. The law establishing the Jubilee, which goes back two and a half thousand years, continues to stimulate models for liberation from oppressive forces, for reconciliation, and for new beginnings⁽¹⁾.

I will argue in this paper that the Sabbatical and Jubilee cycle, with its climactic Year of Jubilee, becomes intelligible once we relate it back to the developments in Egypt at the time of the famine there. The policy adopted by the pharaoh in line with Joseph's counsel is the key to how the Israelite institution came to be formulated. How the formulation chimes with what we know of comparable institutions in the ancient Near East will also come under scrutiny.

I. Survey of the interpretation of the biblical Jubilee since 1950

Bewilderment about the laws of the Sabbatical year and the related Jubilee year in Leviticus 25 is understandable. Their unreal aspect is manifest. Every seven years there is to be no sowing or harvesting throughout the entire land. Every fiftieth year, the Year of Jubilee, one year after the seventh Sabbatical year, the land has again universally to lie fallow. In prospect, then, are two years in succession of fallow conditions that deprive the entire population of its normal source of food. If these rules were actually observed, how, then, would the people eat?

Equally baffling are the requirements that all Israelite slaves must be released from servitude when a Jubilee year comes round and that every Israelite must return to his ancestral land. Commentators are quick to point to the problems. Unlike the equivalent Exodus and Deuteronomic rules, which have slaves released after six years

⁽¹⁾ See the recent volume of essays: H. UCKO ed., *The Jubilee Challenge, Utopia or Possibility* (Geneva 1997).

service, the Levitical law could have a slave serve for forty-nine years. In effect, those who became slaves just after a Jubilee year would never experience freedom. Contrariwise, Alfonso Tostado, writing in the sixteenth century, points out that if the slave's service begins close to a Jubilee year he might only serve a year, or even a few months⁽²⁾. As for the requirement that Israelites have their ancestral property restored to them at the Jubilee, we can only imagine the enormous upheaval that would result because of the relatively complex economic conditions that the laws take for granted. Roland de Vaux assumes that the laws presuppose conditions during the monarchical period in the history of ancient Israel and states, "The practical implementation of the policy meets with insuperable obstacles"⁽³⁾.

Little wonder, then, that critics view the laws as "surrealistic" in the sense that they are impossible to observe⁽⁴⁾. Typical are the following responses to the unrealistic aspects of the different rules in Leviticus 25. The lawgiver is given to artificial theorizing and hyperbole⁽⁵⁾. He shows an optimism that "defies the irregularity of drought conditions which occur on the average of every two to four years"⁽⁶⁾. If enforced, these laws would cripple a society's economy: "Economically a single universal fallow would have been unsound if not disastrous"⁽⁷⁾.

Some critics come to terms with the baffling nature of the laws by treating them as utopian, although it is hardly the term to use when a law requires deprivation to be visited upon an entire population at regular intervals. They speculate that the lawgiver wanted the Israelites, who were coming back from exile in Babylon, to return to a system of landholdings that supposedly existed before

⁽²⁾ A. TOSTADO, *Commentario in Leviticum* (Venice 1596) 283. Indispensable for a survey of the work done on Leviticus 25 is the exhaustive and erudite study of R. NORTH, *Sociology of the Biblical Jubilee* (AnBib 4; Rome 1954).

⁽³⁾ R. DE VAUX, *Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions* (London 1961) 175.

⁽⁴⁾ So B. EERDMANS, *Alttestamentliche Studien*, vol. 4, *Das Buch Leviticus* (Giessen 1912) 123, when he characterizes as a surrealistic gloss Lev 25,20-22 (the provision of food for three years from the harvest of the sixth year).

⁽⁵⁾ See A. BERTHOLET, *Leviticus* (Tübingen 1901) 87.

⁽⁶⁾ N.K. GOTTFELD, "The Biblical Jubilee: In Whose Interests?", *The Jubilee Challenge*, 36.

⁽⁷⁾ NORTH, *Sociology*, 134; also J.A. FAGER, *Land Tenure and the Biblical Jubilee* (JSOTSS 155; Sheffield 1993) 110.

the time of the monarchy⁽⁸⁾. Another very common response is to explain away the unreal aspect of the laws. For example, a universal fallow year is not intended. Individual Israelites can set up their seven-year cycles in keeping with their own agricultural needs: "the Sabbath-year 'fallow' was particular and rotating, not simultaneously universal, at least primitively, and probably also in Lv"⁽⁹⁾. Or, contrary to this view, a universal year is intended but not on all of the land. In line with standard agricultural practice every year some parts of the field would be left fallow, but neighboring areas would still be cultivated. G.C. Chirichigno, who upholds this view, has difficulty in arguing why the seventh year is so special. He postulates a link-up of the Sabbatical year with an "earlier Sabbath institution which had both social-humanitarian and religious-cultic connotations" from the outset⁽¹⁰⁾.

Again, it is very common to argue that the Jubilee year is not really the fiftieth year but is identical to the previous forty-ninth⁽¹¹⁾. By merging the two years, those critics who adhere to this view lessen the unreality of the Israelites having two years in a row given over to fallow conditions on the land. As for the release of slaves, one common rationalization is to claim that the release law of Deuteronomy, in which a slave can choose to become a permanent part of his master's household, still applies. The Levitical law is thinking solely of those slaves who choose not to be manumitted in their seventh year of service but opt to be permanent slaves of a master. The permanence of that slave's status is, in fact, limited, lasting only until the Year of Jubilee⁽¹²⁾. A major influence on those scholars who regard the laws in Leviticus 25 as meant for real life

(8) Representative of this attempt to suggest an appropriate historical context for Leviticus 25 is FAGER, *Land Tenure*, 45-51. B.A. LEVINE, *Leviticus* (JPSTC; Philadelphia 1989) 274, similarly thinks that Leviticus 25 and Nehemiah 5 share the same historical setting in the post-exilic period: "The priestly leaders of the repatriated Judean community formulated a theory to legitimize their situation".

(9) So NORTH, *Sociology*, 120.

(10) See G.C. CHIRICHIGNO, *Debt-Slavery in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (JSOTSS 141; Sheffield 1993) 306. He does not take stock of North's point that an agricultural fallow without plowing would be useless and even harmful, see *Sociology*, 116. If certain fields were left fallow every year they would still have to be plowed over and doing so would go against the intent of the law.

(11) CHIRICHIGNO, *Debt-Slavery*, 318-321.

(12) J.E. HARTLEY, *Leviticus* (WBC 4; Dallas 1992), 433.

is a practice found in the Near East. Albeit at sporadic intervals in contrast to the regularized Israelite institution, a ruler might proclaim a *misharun*, an act of “justice”, and release debt-slaves and land with a view to re-ordering economic life in his community⁽¹³⁾. For those scholars who appeal to this background, the Levitical lawgiver sets up an institution that in some way resembles the Near Eastern example: “The biblical laws of the Jubilee year thus incorporate Near Eastern legal institutions of great antiquity”⁽¹⁴⁾.

Critics sometimes express uneasiness with their rational attempts to explain the laws. Robert North writes, “Obviously our interpretation runs counter to the surface-sense of certain expressions of the sacred text”⁽¹⁵⁾. In fact, the common tendency among all those commentators is to explain away or even to disregard the impractical or implausible elements of the rules, which are, nevertheless, manifestly expressed in the text.

II. The Sabbatical/Jubilee Cycle of Leviticus 25 and the Joseph Story

I wish to take a different approach in attempting to understand these laws. Their very strangeness is the crux of the matter. The aim of the rules is to trigger historical memory and it is precisely the oddness of the provisions which does just that. The Sabbatical year and the integrally linked institution of the Year of Jubilee function, I suggest, as a means of commemorating events particularly during Joseph’s time in Egypt. Like many other biblical laws, for example, the Passover festival and the rest from toil every seventh day, the laws of the Sabbath for the land and the Year of Jubilee recall formative events at the beginning of the nation’s history.

The texts that express the two rules about the Passover and the seventh-day rest explicitly associate the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt with these two institutions (Exod 12,14-27; Deut 5,12-15; 16,1-8). The rules about the Sabbatical and Jubilee years also mention this same period of oppression in Egypt, but they do not

⁽¹³⁾ See, for example, J.J. FINKELSTEIN, “Ammisaduqa’s Edict and the Babylonian ‘Law Codes’”, *JCS* 15 (1961) 91-104. Ammisaduqa’s *misharun* from around 1640 BCE is the only example of a fully preserved edict.

⁽¹⁴⁾ LEVINE, *Leviticus*, 172. M. WEINFELD’s study *Social Justice in Ancient Israel* (Jerusalem 1995) is the most comprehensive yet in laying out such a thesis. I shall return to it.

⁽¹⁵⁾ NORTH, *Sociology*, 119.

openly cite the other major period of time in focus, namely, the preceding era, Joseph's time, when a severe famine afflicted the land. Characteristic of the presentation of the laws of Moses is that he openly refers to the past only when the event, the slavery in Egypt, for example, took place in his own lifetime. He does not cite events before and after his time, for example, the problem of primogeniture posed by Jacob's marriage to a hated and a loved wife (Deut 21,15-17), and the institution of the monarchy when Solomon's excesses are taken account of (Deut 17,14-20). The fictional character of the laws with their attribution to a legendary figure, Moses, accounts for this reticence.

In light of my claim that the Levitical laws about the Sabbatical and Jubilee years hark back to Egyptian history in Joseph's time, it is worth noting how commentators evaluate the narrative in Genesis 47 about the contrast between the Israelites and the Egyptians at the time of the famine. J.B. Skinner observes that "the interest of the biblical account [Gen 47,18-27] is aetiological. The Hebrews were impressed by the vast difference between the land-tenure of Egypt and that under which they themselves lived"⁽¹⁶⁾. B.A. Levine and G.J. Wenham actually compare developments in Genesis 47 with some of the rules in Leviticus 25 but they do not explain why they do so⁽¹⁷⁾. In their assessments, these critics, implicitly in one instance, explicitly in the other two, are contrasting the contents of Genesis 47 with the substance of the rules in Leviticus 25.

Every seventh year the land experiences famine-like conditions⁽¹⁸⁾. These are brought on, not by nature but by people's ceasing to work the land. Indeed, not only are sowing and reaping prohibited, even the natural aftergrowth of the previous year's harvest may not

⁽¹⁶⁾ J.B. SKINNER, *Genesis* (ICC; Edinburgh 1910) 501. If, as seems certain, Skinner has the laws in Leviticus 25 in mind, he assumes that the Israelites actually observed them.

⁽¹⁷⁾ LEVINE, *Leviticus*, 272: "In Leviticus 25 we observe, curiously enough, a similar process [to what Genesis 47 describes]". Levine thanks H.L. Ginzberg for drawing his attention to the similarity; G.J. WENHAM, *Genesis 16-50* (WBC 2; Dallas 1994) 448.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Although critics are clearly aware of this aspect, it does not engage their attention because for them God's ownership of the land is the important idea underlying the Sabbath rest for it. See, for example, H.J. BOECKER, *Law and the Administration of Justice in the Old Testament and Ancient East* (London 1980) 89-92; HARTLEY, *Leviticus*, 433; M. NOTH, *Leviticus* (OTL; London 1965) 186.

be taken. Yet, according to the rule, everyone in the land is fed in the Sabbatical year. The reason is that in the preceding year the deity causes the harvest to be so bountiful that supplies for three years are available from it (Lev 25,2-7. 20-22). The bumper crop is like those from the seven years of plenty in Egypt. Neither the Israelite harvest in the sixth year, nor each of the seven Egyptian harvests is a normal harvest. In each case enough food is grown during fertile times to feed the whole population during the famine or fallow years. In Genesis God directs Joseph to store the harvests (Gen 41,37-40). In Leviticus the explicit statement that old food will be eaten contains the implicit idea that the crops provided by God during the sixth year will be stored and eaten for three years (Lev 25,21,22)⁽¹⁹⁾.

In formulating a law about some matter, the biblical lawgiver typically turns to a first-time occurrence of a problem in the nation's history to see how it was resolved⁽²⁰⁾. The first example in the history of the nation of a famine overcome is in Egypt at the time of Joseph⁽²¹⁾. The famine that afflicts the land threatens starvation but in the event that does not happen. There are in fact seven successive years of famine in Egypt but there is no problem in feeding the Egyptians during these seven years. Joseph's divinely directed policy of storing grain from the bumper harvests that precede the years of famine ensures that all in the land are fed (Gen 41,28).

There are, however, economic and social upheavals brought about by the famine. Genesis 47 singles out a two-year climactic period, presumably at the end of the famine. During the first year of this two-year period the Egyptians give up all their money and

⁽¹⁹⁾ NORTH, *Sociology*, 118, mentions this likelihood. He also cites the rationalizing view of J.D. MICHAELIS, *Mosäisches Recht* (Reutlingen 1793) 2:34, that the blessing on the harvest of the sixth year refers to the completion of the abundance stored up in the other years. E.S. GERSTENBERGER, *Leviticus* (OTL; Louisville 1996) 376, in addressing the issue of how the people are to be fed when the land lies fallow for a year, states, "Joseph's own clever management of stores in Egypt (Gen 41:47-57) may serve to illustrate the tradents' thinking at this point". Gerstenberger also points out (375) that the rest from work on the seventh year only applies to tillable land. Nothing is said about other aspects of work in daily life. The reason, I think, is the focus on the famine in Egypt when there is necessarily a cessation from work on tillable land.

⁽²⁰⁾ On this major feature of all biblical law, see C. CARMICHAEL, *Law, Legend, and Incest in the Bible: Leviticus 18-20* (Ithaca, NY 1997) 9, 10.

⁽²¹⁾ I mean expressly overcome in the sense that a policy is put in place to organize relief from starvation. No such policy is described for the famine that takes Abram to Egypt (Gen 12,10).

then their livestock to pay for the food they receive that year. The transaction with the money will not have been different from the ones to obtain food in the preceding years. The bartering away of the animals, however, heralds a major change in prospect. The next year indeed proves momentous and alters the lives of the Egyptians forever. With their money and their livestock all gone, they have to give over this time their “bodies and their lands” to the pharaoh in order to buy food (Gen 47,18.19). The result is that all the Egyptians lose their private landholdings, which become the property of their king, and they also become permanent slaves to him. From this point on — once the famine is over — the Egyptians receive seed from the pharaoh to sow the land and in return, at harvest time, they are to keep four fifths for themselves and give him the remaining fifth.

In Leviticus 25 the lawgiver introduces the Jubilee year by counting seven Sabbatical years, that is, a period of forty-nine years: “And thou shalt number seven Sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years ...” (Lev 25,8). One of the lawgiver’s aims in specifically highlighting the seventh of the Sabbatical years is to introduce the next year, the fiftieth, as a climactic occasion, the Year of Jubilee. That year, like the Sabbatical year the year before it, is also to be a fallow year for the land. Just as the narrator of Genesis 47 focuses on a two-year climactic period of time, so does the lawgiver.

In the law, during the first year of this two-year period, the forty-ninth year, the people experience famine-like conditions on the land but nonetheless have plenty to eat. After the forty-ninth year, which is the seventh of the Sabbatical years, the Israelites have now experienced, at intervals, seven years of famine-like conditions. The seven Sabbatical years constitute a parallel to the seven years of famine in Joseph’s Egypt⁽²²⁾. Not only are there seven but food is divinely made available for each of the years to provide for the population.

(²²) Manifestly, a commemoration of divine providence in Joseph’s Egypt could not have gone in for the totally unreal parallel of seven fallow years in succession. WEINFELD, *Social Justice*, 175, 178, tries to make sense of the numbers by switching between the feast of weeks in Lev 23,15-21 (with its seven times seven weeks and a following fiftieth day) and references to a Nuzi document (fifty years as the maximum time to mortgage a man for debt) and a Babylonian document from the Seleucid period (fifty years as the maximum time for enslavement because of debt).

The next year, the Year of Jubilee, produces its own parallel to the second year of the climactic two-year period in Joseph's Egypt. Like the developments that take place in Egypt, the events of the Jubilee year entail major social and economic changes. During this fiftieth year, all Israelites are to return to their ancestral landholdings and all Israelite slaves are to be freed from any service to a human master. The outcome is in striking contrast to the Egyptian situation when all the Egyptians lose their landholdings and become enslaved to the one human master, the pharaoh.

Evidence that the lawgiver is looking at the Israelites' history in Egypt when formulating his laws comes from noting that he explicitly draws attention to that history. To explain why Israelites should not experience permanent enslavement the lawgiver states that the Israelites became slaves to Yahweh when he brought them out of Egypt (Lev 25,42.55). The period of time that the lawgiver has in mind at this point is in the years succeeding the famine. Then a new pharaoh appeared — "Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph" (Exod 1,8) — who enslaved the descendants of Jacob's family. It comes about, then, that the Israelites themselves, like the Egyptians in Joseph's generation, become enslaved to the pharaoh. Yahweh, however, ensures that in no way are the Israelites to share the fate of the Egyptians. He causes the Israelites to be released from their service to the pharaoh. The Israelites, instead of being slaves to Pharaoh, become enslaved to their divine master, Yahweh.

We can, I think, only comprehend the laws in Leviticus 25 by setting them against the background of Israel's time in Egypt⁽²³⁾. The Israelites become slaves to their god but there is no bar at the human level to prevent one Israelite from becoming enslaved to another Israelite. The one effect of the notion that Yahweh is Israel's master is that if an Israelite does become a slave his Israelite master is to regard him less as a slave and more as a hired servant or a

(²³) Not surprisingly, interpreters cite texts (Isa 5,8; Mic 2,1.2; Neh 5,3) that point to oppressive forces in Israelite society which would cause the hardships (confiscation of land, debt enslavement) the Year of Jubilee is meant to relieve. See R.C. ELLICKSON – C. DiA. THORLAND, "Ancient Land Law: Mesopotamia, Egypt, Israel", *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 71 (1995) 403. The lawgiver gives no hint, however, in Leviticus 25 that he is thinking of such oppressive forces and the explanation would be that his focus is on Yahweh's doings for the Israelites over against the pharaoh's for the Egyptians.

sojourner. Contrastingly, the Egyptians became enslaved to their human ruler and hence one Egyptian could not become a slave to another Egyptian. Again, the lawgiver claims that the land belongs to Yahweh. That is why at the human level land can be bought and sold but none of it can be sold in perpetuity (Lev 25,23). The contrast is with how in Egypt the pharaoh, a human ruler, because of the famine, becomes the owner of the land, with the implication that no Egyptian can ever again buy or sell any of it.

There are exceptions when it comes to the sale of land in both the Egyptian and Israelite situations, but these exceptions prove revealing. The priests in both places are treated differently from the general population. The Egyptian priests retain their lands because they have a special relationship with the pharaoh (Gen 47,22,26). Likewise the Israelite priests, the Levites, are to have a perpetual possession in the land of Canaan because of their special relationship to Yahweh. For example, the fields of common land belonging to the Levitical cities cannot be sold (Lev 25,34).

The occasion of the Jubilee year is, I submit, to celebrate the difference between the Israelites and the Egyptians in line with the lawgiver's declared aim to set out a policy for the Israelites that contrasts with Egyptian policy. Thus the lawgiver's programmatic statement is, negatively: "After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwell, shall ye not do" (Lev 18,3), and, positively, "Wherefore ye shall do my statutes, and keep my judgments, and do them" (Lev 25,18). Unlike the Egyptians, the Israelites are to retain their landed possessions. Unlike the Egyptians, they are not permanently to become slaves to any human master, because in some sense they are slaves to Yahweh. Unlike the Egyptians, whose entire population became enslaved within one year, every fiftieth year the entire Israelite population is to be free from enslavement. The background to each of the laws in Leviticus 25 is the history of the developments in Egypt as laid out in Genesis 47⁽²⁴⁾. For example,

(²⁴) The significance of the term יובל, "Jubilee," engenders much discussion. The biblical terms יבול and בול, "yield of the harvest, produce from the earth" and חבל, "world," indicate, according to North, that the basic meaning of יבול is "to bring abundantly." He notes that by following this line of reasoning one should conclude that יובל refers to a good harvest. He rejects this conclusion, however, because he states that it is precisely such a harvest that is missing in the יובל, and he opts for the LXX's translation ἄφεσις, "release." But even in regard to ἄφεσις he notes the base meaning to be ἱκετήρ roughly equivalent to

the detailed laws about how individual Israelites should deal with one another in matters of money, land, and houses are necessary to set up the opposing Israelite legal order to that of the Egyptian⁽²⁵⁾.

The Genesis narrative itself takes under review both the time of the famine and the later period of Israel's enslavement to the later pharaoh (Gen 46,4: "I will go down with thee into Egypt and I will also surely bring thee up again"). Its account of how the Israelites, that is, Jacob and his family, fare at the time of the famine in contrast to how the Egyptians fare further illuminates aspects of the laws in Leviticus 25. Whereas the Egyptians become wholly dependent for their livelihood upon the pharaoh, Jacob's family receives from him a holding in the land of Goshen "in the best of the land" of Egypt (Gen 47,6). The term used for their landholding is *חֲזוּזָה* (Gen 47,11.27). The lawgiver uses the same term when he has the Israelites in the Jubilee year return to their landholdings (Lev 25,10.13.41). Moreover, Jacob and his family are sojourners in Egypt and some of them become hired servants to the pharaoh (Gen 47,4.6). In the law in Lev 25,40 an Israelite who becomes dependent upon another Israelite for his survival serves, not as a slave, but as a hired servant and as a sojourner because they are slaves to their ruler Yahweh.

That Joseph's policy of enslavement for the Egyptians should

"send, bring." In light of my thesis drawing a direct link between the *יובל* and the Joseph story, I find it at least suggestive that both the story and the legislation in Leviticus 25 is about Yahweh's abundant provision for the Israelites despite manifest deprivation. In other words, the notion of abundant growth from the land with the emphasis on its being a divine gift is what *יובל* does indeed highlight. The second fallow year, the one after the forty-ninth, is, miraculously, a year of abundance. NORTH's (*Sociology*, 34, 102-105) comment about the term *יובל* in Lev 26,4.20 is pertinent: "Two allusions to abundant crops, *yebul*, Lv 26,4.20, are at least coincidental reminiscences of *yobel*, the jubilee". The root of *יובל* compares with Akkadian *biltu*, from *wabalu*, "to bring", a term particularly used for yields from the soil. See N.P. LEMCHE, "The Manumission of Slaves-the fallow year-the sabbatical year-the jobel year", VT 26 (1976) 50, n. 36.

(²⁵) Egyptian sources indicate that the pharaoh's "ownership" of the land was sometimes real, but oftentimes theoretical. There was much land in private hands. The biblical lawgiver appears to be under the sway of the fiction — much evidenced in Egyptian sources — that the pharaoh owned all the land. See J.G. MANNING, "Demotic Egyptian Instruments of Transfer as Evidence for private Ownership of Real Property", *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 71 (1995) 237-268; D.B. REDFORD, *A Study of the Biblical Story of Joseph* (VTS; Leiden 1970) 237.

invite an Israelite lawgiver's scrutiny is not surprising. The claim that God directs Joseph in all his actions (Gen 41,32; 45,8; 50,20) inevitably raises the question whether or not the Israelites in Canaan should have a similar institutional method of dealing with those who, upon becoming impoverished, have to sell themselves. Moses dictates a policy that is both similar to and, because of Israel's ethnic identity, different from the Egyptian one authored by Joseph. The rule in Lev 25,39 opens with a concern about how a brother should treat an impoverished brother. The formulation may owe something to the first Israelite family of brothers wherein one is in a position of dominance and the others confront impoverishment. The rule closes with the appeal to the Israelite master not to rule over his slave "with rigor." Recalled is the harsh treatment by the later pharaoh when he had the descendants of Joseph and his brothers serve "with rigor" (Exod 1,13.14). The expression (בפֶּרֶךְ) only occurs in the Hebrew Bible in these two passages and in Ezek 34,4.

Further links between the laws and the narrative about Joseph also prove illuminating. The announcement of the Jubilee year takes place on the tenth day of the seventh month, the day when atonement is made for all the people of Israel because of their sins (Lev 25,9). Critics have been greatly puzzled by this linkage. North speaks of an insoluble problem in the clash between Lev 25,10 as a joyful day of return to one's home and family, which is marked by a trumpet-blast, and the solemn Day of Atonement⁽²⁶⁾. In light of the link between the law and Joseph's history, however, the decision to announce the year of the Jubilee on the Day of Atonement is singularly appropriate, for the Day of Atonement recalls a crucial moment in the history of the first family of Israel. It was precisely at the time of the famine, two years into it to be exact, when Joseph effects reconciliation with his brothers (Gen 45,1-15). He then goes on to forgive them their original offense against him (Gen 50,15-21). Their father Jacob, who himself had suffered grievously because of the offense, initiates the process of forgiveness (Gen 50,16). The entire family of Israel as constituted at that time is therefore involved in seeking expiation for wrongdoing⁽²⁷⁾.

⁽²⁶⁾ NORTH, *Sociology*, 99. Cp. N. MICKLEM, *Leviticus* (IB 2; Nashville, TN 1953) 121: "This trumpet is to be sounded, very curiously, on the day of Atonement which is the great penitential day of the Hebrew calendar".

⁽²⁷⁾ The one other reference outside of the Book of Leviticus to the Year of Jubilee is in Num 36,1-12. The heads of households bring to Moses the

The influence of Joseph's policy for the Egyptians illumines other puzzles in the Book of Leviticus. According to Genesis 47 the Egyptians finally settle down to a life of serfdom under the pharaoh. He gives them seed to sow the land and at harvest time they take four fifths for themselves and hand over a fifth to the pharaoh. The concluding two chapters of Leviticus, 26 and 27, set out the Israelite equivalent to this arrangement between supreme authority and subject. Leviticus 26 outlines the kind of relationship the Israelites should have with Yahweh. He will guarantee their harvests in return for their allegiance to his governance:

"If ye walk in my statutes, and keep my commandments, and do them; Then I will give you rain in due season, and the land shall yield her increase, and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit. And your threshing shall reach unto the vintage, and the vintage shall reach unto the sowing time; and ye shall eat your bread to the full, and dwell in your land safely" (Lev 26,3-5)⁽²⁸⁾.

Like the pharaoh providing seed for all the Egyptians (Gen 47,23), Yahweh provides food for the Israelites, even attending to the initial process of the growth of the seed itself.

Critics assume that the peroration about loyalty in Leviticus 26 is the conclusion to the Book of Leviticus, and that the rules in Leviticus 27 about dedications to Yahweh constitute some kind of addendum⁽²⁹⁾. The matter is otherwise, however, if the lawgiver is laying out the Israelite equivalent to the concluding developments in Genesis 47. The Year of Jubilee comes into reckoning in these rules (Lev 27,17.18.21.23.24), one indication that they do not constitute an appendix but follow on naturally because of the lawgiver's focus on Genesis 47. Pharaoh acquires both the Egyptians' possessions and their persons, and he enters into a

problem about the loss of inheritance to another tribe at the Jubilee should the daughters of Zelophehad marry men from outside their tribe. Num 36,1.5.12 expressly state that the households in question are those of the sons of Joseph. For the links between the Day of Atonement and the Joseph Story, see C. CARMICHAEL, "The Story of Joseph and the Book of Jubilees", *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (eds. T.H. LIM – L. HURTADO – G. AULD – A. JACK) (Edinburgh 1999).

⁽²⁸⁾ The term for the harvest increase is יבולה. See note 24.

⁽²⁹⁾ M. NOTH, *Exodus* (OTL; Philadelphia 1962) 203: "Clearly a later supplement"; N.H. SNAITH, *Leviticus and Numbers* (CB; London 1967) 174: "This chapter has been added".

transaction with them when he gives them seed to grow in the fields. Leviticus 27 addresses issues about Yahweh's claims to an Israelite's possessions and person, and the transactions that follow.

For the Levitical lawgiver the figure of Yahweh corresponds to the figure of the pharaoh. He is, however, alert to the obvious fact that in translating this correspondence into real life the perception of Yahweh is necessarily different from the perception of the pharaoh⁽³⁰⁾. Yahweh does not have power over the Israelites in the same way that the pharaoh has power over the Egyptians. Consequently, the situations of the Egyptians and the Israelites differ. The Egyptians have no fields or houses or animals to give over to the pharaoh because he has already acquired them, nor can they give their persons because they already belong to him. The only transaction they enter into with the pharaoh concerns the production of food. He gives them seed to sow the fields and later at the harvest they keep four fifths of its yield for themselves and give him the remaining fifth.

In regard to their possessions and persons the Israelites have a different but related order from the Egyptian one. Sometimes Yahweh, like the pharaoh, unconditionally requires the Israelites to hand over certain of their animals, certain produce from their fields, and even certain persons (those "devoted" or "banned" [חרם], Lev 27,28,29). The exercise of such absolute authority on the part of Yahweh is on a scale comparable to the pharaoh's at the time of the famine. Although I would stress that the ruling power in Israel is but analogous to the one in Egypt it seems clear that there has been a conscious attempt to relate the effects of the one to the other. Thus the rates of redemption in the rules for persons who are dedicated to Yahweh (as against those "banned") appear to be the equivalent of those for slaves⁽³¹⁾. In other words, the analogous, not strictly parallel, Israelite situation to the Egyptian one is that of the religious equivalent of secular slavery.

Other times an Israelite, unlike an Egyptian with the pharaoh,

⁽³⁰⁾ The major problem for Weinfeld and others who see the ideology of the ancient Near Eastern kings transferred to the Israelite god, Yahweh, is to explain how this transfer has been accomplished.

⁽³¹⁾ GERSTENBERGER, *Leviticus*, 441: "Prices probably reflect tariffs customary among slave traders"; WENHAM, *Leviticus*, 338: "To free themselves from the vow, they had instead to pay to the sanctuary the price they would command in the slave market".

can freely hand over to Yahweh fields, houses, animals, and persons. Any compulsion to do so comes from within the Israelite himself. For example, he might dedicate a house or field to Yahweh. He can take it back but an act of redemption is necessary. There is also an additional cost to the transaction. He has to pay a one fifth premium over the value that the receiving priest on behalf of Yahweh had originally placed on the gift. The premium is like the one fifth value of the harvest that the Egyptian has to pay to his lord and master for the initial seed that he gives to his serf. Interestingly, when an Israelite redeems a field he actually pays the extra premium according to the seed that is sown in the field (Lev 27.16.19). Even though the Israelite situation is necessarily different from the Egyptian, the assessment for the Egyptians may have influenced the assessment for the Israelites.

It is common to think that the biblical lawgiver only constructs laws as a direct response to social and economic forces in his time. But that is to entertain a too narrow, overly passive conception of the nature of law. Sometimes laws aim to shape or reinforce cultural identity. The laws in Leviticus 25–27 are of this kind. They are literary constructions that incorporate symbolic pointers to historical events. The lawgiver's intent is to give sharper definition to an Israelite's identity by having him recall his nation's experience when living in a foreign land.

III. Dreams, Levitical Sabbatical and Jubilee Laws

The story of Joseph itself presents a literary construction elements of which encapsulate historical events in symbolic form. I refer to the famous dreams. Each of the dreams, Joseph's, the butler's, the baker's, and the pharaoh's, alludes to historical developments. Indeed, the pharaoh's dreams may well have inspired the Levitical lawgiver.

It is first of all interesting to note that, like the Levitical Sabbatical and Jubilee laws, the dreams use numbers to convey the passage of time in Egyptian history. The three branches on the vine in the butler's dream represent three days within which period of time he is released from prison and becomes his master's butler again (Gen 40,13). In the baker's dream the three baskets of cakes on his head betoken the three days within which he too is released from prison, but is hanged on the third day. More pertinent for our purposes are the pharaoh's own dreams in which there are seven sleek cows,

seven gaunt ones, also seven plump ears of grain and seven blighted ones. Alluded to is the combination of the seven years of plenty and the seven years of famine, precisely the combination that the lawgiver focuses on in his seven Sabbatical years and the seven times seven-year periods culminating with the year of the Jubilee.

If we ask ourselves what came first, the dreams or the legend of the famine in Egypt and Joseph's role in it, the answer has to be the alleged history. The dreams will have been formulated in response to some original outline of that history. From a rational viewpoint it is just not likely either that the dreams and the history belong together originally, or that the dreams did indeed generate the history. When the lawgiver constructs his laws about the Sabbatical and Jubilee years on the basis of the Joseph story, he engages in a process as sophisticated as the one that integrated the dreams into the story⁽³²⁾.

In a recent study, Moshe Weinfeld claims that the contents of the laws about the Sabbatical and Jubilee years are "rooted in the reality of the Ancient Near East, but are permeated with idealistic-utopian elements"⁽³³⁾. What he means is that the kinds of relief for the indigent that are laid out in Leviticus 25 can be duplicated, more or less, in Near Eastern sources. He suggests that in a remote period in ancient Israel the institution of the Jubilee had a social reality in "communal tribal society"⁽³⁴⁾. It continued to exist but experienced breakdown because of changing economic circumstances. In a decidedly deteriorated form it re-emerged with royal edicts of the type familiar to us from Mesopotamia, Egypt, Persia, and Greece: proclamations that released debts and restored property. What the biblical authors did was to preserve in theory the substance of the supposedly ancient laws about the Jubilee and the release of debts and idealistically attribute the proclamations to the Israelite god because Israel's religion had an ethical character not matched in, for example, Mesopotamian religion⁽³⁵⁾.

There is much that is speculative about Weinfeld's sketch of a biblical institution. There may also be an apologetic undercurrent,

⁽³²⁾ C. WESTERMANN, *Genesis 37–50. A Commentary* (Minneapolis 1986) 39, states: "The author has amalgamated the dreams with his story in such a way that they can be explained only out of the context in which they now stand".

⁽³³⁾ WEINFELD, *Social Justice*, 127.

⁽³⁴⁾ *Ibid.*, 178.

⁽³⁵⁾ *Ibid.*, 16, 17.

the claim about the uniquely ethical character of Israel's religion, and possibly a desire to locate ancient Israel firmly within the firmament of the nations of the Near East in a fashion that today's Israel would like to emulate. Nonetheless, it would be foolish not to recognize that the ideas that underlie the biblical laws had indeed some basis in the life of ancient Israel despite the lack of direct evidence. When Weinfeld states that the proclamation of liberty in Leviticus 25 is "functionally speaking identical with" the Mesopotamian edicts, he hastens to add the important qualification that the literary framework into which the Israelite institution has been woven adds "a utopic coloring"⁽³⁶⁾. My claim is that this coloring, if not everything, is of crucial importance. The biblical scribe sets out to recall Israel's legendary past in Egypt with a view to laying out an institution that, however much it may resemble contemporary ones in either the Israel of his time or among his neighbors, differs significantly from them. The difference lies in the fact that the scribe sketches it by way of contrasting it with the Egyptian institution in Joseph's time. Indeed, what is inside the literary framework should not, as Weinfeld implies, be kept separate from the framework itself. If my inclination is to maximize the inventiveness of the biblical scribe, Weinfeld's is to reduce it to a religious gloss.

Department of Comparative Literature
145 Goldwin Smith Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853

Calum CARMICHAEL

SUMMARY

The comparative method is of limited value in locating the Sabbatical/Jubilee cycle of Leviticus 25 within the framework of similar institutions in the ancient Near East. Not only is the character of the biblical institution distinctively Israelite, but so is the manner in which the Levitical lawgiver devised the entire cycle. The lawgiver formulated rules to ensure that the Israelites do not do what the Egyptians did in their land (Lev 18,3). Borrowing details from the Genesis account of the seven-year famine in Egypt, the lawgiver set out Yahweh's scheme for his people's welfare. The scheme stands opposed to the pharaoh's for the Egyptians at the time of the famine.

(³⁶) Ibid., 156.

ANIMADVERSIONES

La lavanda dei piedi di Gv 13,1-20, il *Romanzo di Esopo* e i *Saturnalia* di Macrobio

1. La lavanda dei piedi in Gv 13,1-20 da rito di accoglienza a rito di iniziazione

In un articolo pubblicato nel 1996⁽¹⁾, abbiamo sostenuto che il lavaggio dei piedi a cui Gesù sottopone i discepoli in Gv 13,1-20 è un rito di inversione con il quale il Gesù di Giovanni trasforma il rito di ingresso in casa costituito dal lavaggio dei piedi, comune a molte culture del mondo antico, in un rito di ingresso al discepolato (e cioè di iniziazione). Questa trasformazione di funzione è ottenuta, tra l'altro, anche mediante la collocazione del gesto *fuori* del suo posto usuale, e cioè non al momento dell'ingresso in casa o all'inizio della cena, ma *durante* la cena. In questo modo, il rito di ingresso non introduce in casa o nella cena, ma in un rapporto nuovo tra Gesù e i discepoli, un rapporto definito dal gesto di Gesù che si fa schiavo. Il gesto, cioè, introduce nel discepolato e, infatti, subito dopo Gesù trasmette una dottrina nuova e un comandamento nuovo, elementi — questi — tipici dei processi di iniziazione.

Per sostenere la fondatezza di questa interpretazione abbiamo presentato una serie di argomentazioni:

1. Il rito del lavaggio dei piedi (a) è diffuso nel mondo antico, sia in quello ebraico (a questo proposito abbiamo citato Gn 18,4-5; 24,32-33; 19,2; 43,24⁽²⁾; cf. anche Lc 7,44), sia in quello greco-romano (a questo proposito abbiamo citato Platone, *Convivio*, 175a; Petronio, *Satyricon*, 31; Plutarco, *Focio*, 18,3; *Mulierum Virtutes*, 242e-263c; *Joseph et Aseneth*,

⁽¹⁾ A. DESTRO – M. PESCE, "La lavanda dei piedi nel Vangelo di Giovanni: un rito di inversione", *Atti del VI Simposio di Efeso su S. Giovanni apostolo* (L. PADOVESE, a cura di) (Turchia: La Chiesa e la sua storia, XI; Roma 1996) 9-27; l'articolo è stato ripubblicato in forma in parte diversa in: A. DESTRO – M. PESCE, "L'iniziazione dei discepoli nel Vangelo di Giovanni: La lavanda dei piedi come rito di ingresso al discepolato", *Iniziazione cristiana degli adulti oggi*. Atti della XXVI settimana di Studio dell'Associazione Professori di Liturgia. 31 agosto - 5 settembre 1997 (B.E.L. Subsidia 99; Roma 1998) 47-74; una edizione in inglese è stata presentata il 23 maggio 1997 a Praga al convegno *The Gospel in Context* con il titolo "The Footwashing in the Gospel of John: A ritual of Inversion". Sul contesto rituale di Gv 13-17 cf. A. DESTRO – M. PESCE, "L'ultima sera di Gesù con i discepoli. Spazi diversi per riti diversi (Gv 14,31)", *Atti del VII Simposio di Efeso su S. Giovanni apostolo* (L. PADOVESE, a cura di) (Turchia: La Chiesa e la sua storia, XIII; Roma 1999) 65-98; A. DESTRO – M. PESCE, "La gestualità nei libri della Bibbia", *La gestualità e la Bibbia* (P. STEFANI, a cura di) (Brescia 1999) 43-63.

⁽²⁾ Su questi quattro testi e su Es 30,17-21; 40,31, cf., DESTRO – PESCE, "La gestualità nei libri della Bibbia", 50-53.

7,1-2; 13,12; 20,2-3); (b) non era un rito finalizzato primariamente al pranzo o alla cena, bensì all'ingresso in casa; (c) era generalmente eseguito dagli schiavi (uomini o donne) oppure da donne della famiglia (la moglie nei riguardi del padrone di casa oppure le sue figlie); (d) simboleggiava la struttura sociale in quanto confermava nei propri ruoli sociali il padrone, gli schiavi, le donne della famiglia e gli ospiti.

2. Il gesto di Gesù non va interpretato alla luce dei passi biblici del libro della Genesi, a volte addotti da alcuni esegeti⁽³⁾, bensì alla luce della prassi greco-romana, condivisa dagli ebrei palestinesi e della diaspora.

3. Il collegamento del gesto di Gesù al rito del lavaggio dei piedi greco-romano è reso evidente in base ai seguenti motivi: (a) Gesù depo-nendo l'ἱμάτιον resta vestito con il χιτὼν come gli schiavi che servivano durante i banchetti; (b) il termine λέντιον, riferito al panno di cui Gesù si cinge, è il termine tecnico per l'asciugamano di lino usato nei banchetti greco-romani⁽⁴⁾; (c) la reazione di Pietro indica che egli non sopportava che Gesù assumesse il gesto tipico degli schiavi.

4. A.M. Beavis, in un articolo del 1992, aveva mostrato quanta importanza avessero gli schiavi nelle parabole di Gesù e indicava come testi utili per la comprensione della funzione degli schiavi nel mondo antico il *Romanzo di Esopo* e le *Commedie* di Plauto⁽⁵⁾. Nel nostro articolo, approfondendo questa prospettiva, sostenevamo che la funzione dello schiavo nel mondo antico era di fare ciò che il padrone non può fare⁽⁶⁾. Egli aveva perciò non solo una funzione esecutiva, ma anche una importante funzione creativa. In secondo luogo, sostenevamo che lo schiavo aveva la funzione di distanziare i ruoli all'interno della *household*⁽⁷⁾. Questi due elementi chiariscono uno degli scopi del gesto di Gesù. Il proporre ai discepoli l'assunzione della funzione reciproca dello schiavo tendeva all'eliminazione della differenza dei ruoli all'interno della società dei discepoli e perciò proponeva l'instaurazione di una società di amici⁽⁸⁾.

⁽³⁾ Questi testi non possono essere addotti come spiegazione dell'uso dell'immagine del lavaggio dei piedi da parte del redattore del *Vangelo*. Essi non costituiscono un vero sottotesto biblico del brano evangelico, perchè non pongono alcuna attenzione alle persone che lavano i piedi ai forestieri. L'unica cosa che sottolineano è che viene messa a disposizione dell'acqua, ma non chi compie questo atto. È perciò all'ambiente culturale greco-romano o ebraico (palestinese e della diaspora) che bisogna fare ricorso per comprendere il significato culturale di questo atto nel *Vangelo di Giovanni* (DESTRO – PESCE, "La lavanda dei piedi", 13-14; "L'iniziazione dei discepoli nel Vangelo di Giovanni", 56).

⁽⁴⁾ J. CARCOPINO, *La vita quotidiana a Roma all'apogeo dell'impero* (Bari-Roma 1995) 313; DESTRO – PESCE, "L'iniziazione dei discepoli nel Vangelo di Giovanni", 66.

⁽⁵⁾ A.M. BEAVIS, "Ancient Slavery as an Interpretive Context for the New Testament Servant Parables with Special Reference to the Unjust Stewart (Luke 16,1-8)", *JBL* 111 (1992) 37-54.

⁽⁶⁾ J.F. GARDNER – TH. WIEDEMANN, *The Roman Household. A Sourcebook* (London – New York 1991).

⁽⁷⁾ R. SALLER, "La schiavitù e la famiglia romana", *La schiavitù nel mondo antico* (M.I. FINLEY, a cura di) (Bari 1997) 95-129, qui 96, 114, 121-122.

⁽⁸⁾ DESTRO – PESCE, "La lavanda dei piedi", 21-23; id., "L'iniziazione dei discepoli nel Vangelo di Giovanni", 67-69.

2. Il romanzo di Esopo e la lavanda dei piedi in Gv 13

Grazie a una recente traduzione italiana, pubblicata nel luglio del 1997⁽⁹⁾, abbiamo individuato nel *Romanzo di Esopo* il più completo e interessante parallelo alla lavanda dei piedi del *Vangelo di Giovanni*. Un parallelo, questo, che è normalmente ignorato dall'esegesi. Ecco il testo nella traduzione di Bonelli e Sandrolini:

E lo condusse nella casa [il soggetto dell'azione è lo schiavo Esopo], gli fece scaricare la legna, lo pagò e gli disse: «Zio, il mio padrone [Xanto] ti prega di restare a mangiare con lui; lascia dunque l'asino nel recinto e sarà trattato con ogni riguardo». Il campagnolo entrò nella sala del banchetto, senza chiedere i motivi di quell'invito. Si introdusse così com'era, sporco di fango, e con i calzari ai piedi. Xanto si chiese: «Sarebbe questo il tipo che bada solo ai fatti suoi?». E avendo notato che Esopo ne incensava le qualità, interpellò la moglie: «Mia signora, vuoi che Esopo riceva una bella lezione?» La moglie di Xanto rispose: «Te ne prego!» Xanto allora le propose: «Fa dunque come ti dico. Alzati e va' e porta il catino all'ospite come se dovessi lavare i suoi piedi. E quello dal tuo portamento dignitoso riconoscerà che sei la padrona di casa e non permetterà che tu lo faccia, ma ti dirà 'Signora, non c'è forse uno schiavo per lavarmi i piedi?' Così mostrerà la sua natura di impiccione ed Esopo sarà fustigato». La moglie di Xanto, spinta dall'odio che covava per Esopo, si cinse i fianchi (περιζωσμένη) di un *panno di lino* (λέντιον) e gettatosene un altro sulle spalle portò il catino all'ospite. Questi si accorse che si trattava della padrona di casa, ma pensò tra sé: «Xanto è filosofo: se avesse voluto che i miei piedi fossero lavati da uno schiavo l'avrebbe ordinato. Se invece vuole farmi l'onore di lasciare che sua moglie mi lavi i piedi, non voglio smentire la mia fama: non cercherò di intromettermi per sapere, ma tenderò i piedi perchè me li lavi». E una volta lavato, si sdraiò (*Romanzo di Esopo*, 61)⁽¹⁰⁾.

Questo testo fornisce il parallelo maggiore che sia stato finora trovato, sia dal punto di vista del contenuto, sia da quello letterario, per quanto riguarda gli aspetti concreti del rito del lavare i piedi di Gv 13, 1-20. Il *Romanzo di Esopo* infatti: 1. suppone che il lavare i piedi all'ospite sia un gesto tipico degli schiavi («riconoscerà che sei la padrona di casa e non permetterà che tu lo faccia, ma ti dirà 'Signora, non c'è forse uno schiavo per lavarmi i piedi?'»); 2. parla dell'asciugamano di lino degli schiavi, usando il medesimo termine, λέντιον, del *Vangelo di Giovanni* (Gv 13,4). Le concordanze notano che il termine è un *hapax* in Giovanni che non si

⁽⁹⁾ *Romanzo di Esopo*. Introduzione e testo critico a cura di Franco Ferrari. Traduzione e note di Guido Bonelli e Giorgio Sandrolini (Milano 1997).

⁽¹⁰⁾ *Romanzo di Esopo*, 158-161. La traduzione di Bonelli e Sandrolini è stata da noi modificata in pochi punti.

trova nè nel Nuovo Testamento nè nella LXX. Il testo del *Romanzo di Esopo* conferma che il termine proviene dal consueto linguaggio simposiale greco-romano, come già avevamo sostenuto nell'articolo del 1996⁽¹¹⁾; 3. usa il verbo περιζώννυμι che è molto simile al verbo διαζώννυμι usato da Gv 13,4; 4. parla dell'uso di cingersi con un panno di lino (λέντιον) per il lavaggio dei piedi (e questo è l'unico caso parallelo trovato finora); 5. parla di un catino con l'acqua come in Gv 13, 5, anche se il termine usato dal *Vangelo di Giovanni* (νιπήρ) è diverso da quello del *Romanzo di Esopo* 61 (λεκάνη).

Questo testo è di importanza rilevante per l'interpretazione della lavanda dei piedi in Giovanni perchè conferma in modo indubitabile che Gv 13,1-20 va collocato sullo sfondo delle usanze greco-romane di accoglienza in casa e simposiali.

Il χιτών, il catino, il λέντιον, il cingersi, il lavare i piedi sono oggetti o gesti normali e necessari del consueto rito di accoglienza ed è per questo che sono scelti da Giovanni e non per un loro presunto significato spirituale, separato da un preciso contesto culturale e sociale. Si tratta di un insieme di gesti inscindibili propri dell'azione dello schiavo che lava i piedi all'ospite. Giovanni ha voluto dire che Gesù ha fatto proprio questo gesto degli schiavi. Qualsiasi interpretazione deve partire da questo dato. Ciò significa che il testo del *Vangelo di Giovanni*, nei suoi particolari e nel suo complesso, acquista senso solo nel contesto di quella cultura greco-romana di cui anche il giudaismo palestinese e della diaspora del I secolo faceva parte.

Ciò significa che Giovanni ha voluto risignificare uno dei gesti più diffusi nella società greco-romana dei suoi tempi. «Gesù *utilizza un simbolo non religioso* per rendere efficace non solo la comunicazione (si comprende solo ciò che si conosce e cui si partecipa) ma anche e soprattutto per rendere efficace e anzi possibile lo scopo etico-religioso che si propone la iniziazione dei discepoli. Gesù assume un simbolo dalla struttura sociale contemporanea, ponendo al centro un gesto ben noto e comprensibile nel quale si evidenziano e si riassumono tutti i ruoli di una società. Il gesto assunto come simbolo è però fondamentalmente criticato e rovesciato rispetto all'uso comune. Non sono gli schiavi che devono lavare i piedi, ma i superiori. In altri termini, il redattore sceglie intenzionalmente di intervenire su una concezione culturale dello schiavo, comunemente accettata, ma la modifica. Propone che il modello da imitare non sia quello incentrato sulla funzione del padrone, ma quello imperniato sulla funzione dello schiavo. Lo schiavo produce salvezza, lo schiavo produce uguaglianza o meglio equa reciprocità. Si tratta di un'iniziazione che non tende a confermare la struttura culturale, ma a proporre elementi nuovi per la creazione di una struttura comunitaria che non ripeta quella della società normale»⁽¹²⁾.

⁽¹¹⁾ DESTRO – PESCE, "La lavanda dei piedi", 21; cf. "L'iniziazione dei discepoli nel Vangelo di Giovanni", 66.

⁽¹²⁾ DESTRO – PESCE, "L'iniziazione dei discepoli nel Vangelo di Giovanni", 70.

3. Jan Sammer su Gv 13, 1-20 e il Romanzo di Esopo

Il primo ad individuare questo parallelo tra la lavanda dei piedi del *Vangelo di Giovanni* e il *Romanzo di Esopo* è stato Jan Sammer. Il fatto che egli abbia comunicato la sua scoperta in un articolo pubblicato nel 1993 su una rivista irreperibile nelle biblioteche europee ed americane⁽¹³⁾, ha fatto sì che il suo contributo sia rimasto ignoto⁽¹⁴⁾. Noi abbiamo fatto per più di un anno ogni tentativo per reperire la rivista. Solo alla fine di dicembre del 1998 abbiamo potuto leggere l'articolo quando Sammer ce ne ha gentilmente inviato copia. Nel suo articolo, egli afferma che l'uso di lavare i piedi appartiene a «Greek and Roman customs». Adduce come esempi il *Symposion* di Platone e il *Satyricon* di Petronio. Ma sostiene anche, erroneamente, che «no mention of foot washing in connection with meals can be found in Jewish sources including ritual observances prescribed in the Old Testament or the voluminous Midrashic commentaries on them»⁽¹⁵⁾. Ciò non corrisponde a verità, come dimostrano i passi biblici del libro della Genesi (18,4-5; 24,32-33; 43,24; 19,2) spesso citati dagli esegeti come parallelo di Gv 13. La LXX di Gn 18,4 sembra essere attenta al ruolo degli schiavi nel lavare i piedi e Filone in *Quaest. Gn* IV 5 ha interpretato allegoricamente il medesimo brano⁽¹⁶⁾. Anche 1 Sam 25,41 non dovrebbe essere dimenticato⁽¹⁷⁾. Neppure nella letteratura midrashica il tema è ignoto (cf. *Mekilta ad Es* 21,2)⁽¹⁸⁾.

Sammer evidenzia giustamente che l'atto del lavaggio dei piedi era generalmente compito degli schiavi: «In better households a slave came around with a wash basin and a towel to perform this service for the new arrival. In ordinary households, where there was no slaves, the guest would generally wash his own feet; only in rare instances when the host received in his

⁽¹³⁾ Nell'autunno del 1997, Jan Sammer rendeva noto nella lista di discussione esegetica «Crosstalk» su Internet di avere individuato per la prima volta un nuovo e importante parallelo alla lavanda dei piedi del *Vangelo di Giovanni* nel *Romanzo di Esopo* e di avere pubblicato al proposito un articolo: "Why Did Jesus Wash His Disciples Feet?", *Aeon. A Journal of Myth and Science* III No.4 (1993) 21-23. La discussione può essere confrontata su «Crosstalk» alla voce «Footwashing» dal 9 all'11 novembre 1997. L'indirizzo della rivista è: Aeon, 2326 Knapp, Ames, IA 50010.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Nel corso della discussione su «Crosstalk» Sammer ci comunicava che anche in ceco esisteva una traduzione del *Romanzo di Esopo*: «I read it for the first time in the fall of 1992 in Czech translation: (Svet Ezopských bajek, translation Vaclav Bahnik, Marie Kuthanova, Jiri Vales, Svoboda Publishers, 1976) and was immediately struck by the close analogy to John 13».

⁽¹⁵⁾ SAMMER "Why Did Jesus Wash", 21.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cf. H. WEISS, *Footwashing in the Johannine Community*, NT 21 (1979) 298-325, qui 302-304; DESTRO – PESCE, "La gestualità nei libri della Bibbia", 52 e 60 nota 9.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Cf. DESTRO – PESCE, "La gestualità nei libri della Bibbia", 52.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Sui paralleli biblici, giudaico ellenistici e rabbinici, cf. DESTRO – PESCE, "La lavanda dei piedi", 13-14; "L'iniziazione dei discepoli nel Vangelo di Giovanni", 55-56. Cf. R.E. BROWN, *Giovanni*. Commento al vangelo spirituale (Assisi 1991) 673; J. MATEOS – J. BARRETO, *Il Vangelo di Giovanni* (Assisi 1982) 555; F. MANNS, "Le lavement des pieds. Essai sur la structure et la signification de Jean 13", *L'Evangile de Jean à la lumière du Judaïsme* (Jerusalem 1991) 321-337; G. SEGALLA, *Giovanni*. Versione. Introduzione. Note (Cinisello Balsamo Milano 1990) 361; CH. NIEMAND, *Die Fusswaschungserzählung des Johannesevangeliums*. Untersuchungen zu ihrer Entstehung und Überlieferung im Urchristentum (Roma 1993).

home a prominent person, his superior, or someone of a higher social class, did he himself wash the feet of his guest — but this was considered an extraordinary expression of respect. An interesting example of this custom is related in the anonymous Greek biography of Aesop». Sammer cita poi in traduzione inglese il *Romanzo di Esopo*, 61 commentandolo come segue: «These lines contain some remarkable parallels to John's account of the foot washing at the last Supper. They reveal both the purpose of this custom and its social connotations: in ancient Greece and Rome the washing of feet generally preceded lying down at the table; it was a service performed by slaves for newly arrived guest. This explains the instinctive reaction of Peter — Jesus was his master, but was doing the duty of a slave»⁽¹⁹⁾.

Concordiamo con Sammer sul fatto che il lavaggio dei piedi nel mondo antico fosse eseguito prevalentemente da schiavi⁽²⁰⁾. Siamo anche d'accordo che la reazione di Pietro si spieghi solo sullo sfondo di questo uso: Pietro sa che i piedi sono lavati dagli schiavi e non può permettere che Gesù esegua questa funzione. Parlare semplicemente di 'umiltà' sarebbe una ingenuità metodologica. L'umiltà, infatti, si concretizza sempre in forme culturali particolari.

Non concordiamo, invece, con Sammer quando afferma che «According to John, the foot washing took place as soon as the apostles arrived and sat down. The reason is evident from the story of Aesop: the guest must be sitting, so that he can stretch out his feet to be washed. Some information is missing at this point, since in the verses that follow the guest are already lying down»⁽²¹⁾. Non è vero, infatti, che il lavaggio dei piedi «took place as soon as the apostles arrived and sat down». Al contrario, il lavaggio dei piedi ebbe luogo «durante la cena», mentre Gesù e i discepoli già mangiavano: δείπνου γινόμενου, «mentre si svolgeva il pasto» (Gv 13,2)⁽²²⁾. Il redattore immagina che la cena sia cominciata da tempo e non sia ancora finita. E ciò per due motivi. Anzitutto, *Gesù si alza dalla posizione sdraiata del mangiare*, e perciò la cena era già iniziata, compie il gesto e poi si rimette a giacere. La lavanda dei piedi interrompe quindi il banchetto. In secondo luogo, dopo essersi nuovamente sdraiato, Gesù intinge un boccone e lo porge a Giuda Iscariota. Il che rende ancor più verosimile che non avessero finito di mangiare. Solo alla fine del capitolo 14 Gesù dirà: «Alzatevi. Andiamo via di qua» (14,31)⁽²³⁾. È doveroso concludere che il redattore abbia intenzionalmente collocato la lavanda dei piedi *durante* la cena⁽²⁴⁾.

Del resto, anche Sammer sembra trovarsi in imbarazzo a questo

⁽¹⁹⁾ SAMMER "Why Did Jesus Wash", 21-22.

⁽²⁰⁾ Ma Sammer dimentica che era eseguito anche da donne, in quanto esponenti di un ceto sociale inferiore; cf. DESTRO – PESCE, "La lavanda dei piedi", 14; "L'iniziazione dei discepoli nel Vangelo di Giovanni", 56-57.

⁽²¹⁾ SAMMER "Why Did Jesus Wash", 22.

⁽²²⁾ Cf. GNT³; NTG²⁶. Cf. anche BROWN, *Giovanni*, 654; SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium. III. Teil. Kommentar zu Kap. 13-21* (Freiburg 1979)17; J.C. THOMAS, *The Footwashing in the Johannine Community* (Sheffield 1992).

⁽²³⁾ Su Gv 14,31 e sul cambiamento di stanza che la frase implica cf. DESTRO – PESCE, "L'ultima sera di Gesù con i discepoli", 65-98.

⁽²⁴⁾ Cf. DESTRO – PESCE, "La lavanda dei piedi", 11-12; id., "L'iniziazione dei discepoli nel Vangelo di Giovanni", 53-54.

proposito: «Some information is missing at this point, since in the verses that follow the guest are already lying down». La spiegazione sta nel fatto che il gesto di Gesù è 'fuori posto', rispetto all'uso consueto. È questo che conferisce alla lavanda di Gesù un carattere specifico sul quale si costruisce il significato nuovo che Gesù vuole trasmettere. Di ciò abbiamo a lungo discusso in passato⁽²⁵⁾.

4. *Gv 13,1-20 come rito di inversione e i Saturnalia di Macrobio*

Nei nostri studi precedenti abbiamo sostenuto che la lavanda dei piedi descritta da Gv 13,1-20 è uno di quei riti che gli antropologi chiamano «riti di inversione di status»⁽²⁶⁾. Al centro di questo rito di inversione campeggia certamente il ruolo dei discepoli come soggetti destinatari. Ciò risulta dalle due spiegazioni di Gesù stesso (Gv 13,6-11.12-17). In primo luogo, l'effetto dell'azione rituale di Gesù è di inserire i discepoli nella propria vicenda, facendo in modo che abbiano «parte» con lui mediante un'azione che ha un effetto trasformativo (Gv 13,8: prima spiegazione). In secondo luogo, Gesù desidera che i discepoli capiscano quello che egli ha fatto loro con il rito e perciò pone la domanda: «sapete cosa vi ho fatto?» (Gv 13,12: seconda spiegazione). Il dativo «a voi» chiarisce senza ombra di dubbio che il rito è rivolto ai discepoli. Ciò non toglie, tuttavia, che esso sia rivolto anche a Gesù stesso. Ciò è vero per due motivi. Anzitutto, la lavanda dei piedi implica un'azione che Gesù opera sulla propria persona. Egli compie gesti che hanno come luogo di manifestazione il suo stesso corpo. Cambia momentaneamente il proprio aspetto e si mostra esteriormente diverso. In secondo luogo, se fino al capitolo 12 Gesù era il *rivelatore* che compie segni (e va incontro ad un progressivo rifiuto), a partire dal capitolo 13 egli entra nella sua «ora», accetta cioè il destino della sua morte⁽²⁷⁾.

Sulla lavanda dei piedi J. Neyrey ha scritto nel 1995 un articolo nel quale distingue due tipi diversi di riti: il «transformation ritual» (che avrebbe funzione trasformativa) e la «ceremony» (che avrebbe funzione essenzialmente conservativa). Nella sua interpretazione, lo strato più antico del *Vangelo di Giovanni* prevedeva un rito trasformativo che, invece, nei vv. 13,12-20 si tramuterebbe in «cerimonia»⁽²⁸⁾. Qui ci limitiamo a mettere in luce la differenza principale del nostro contributo. A differenza di Neyrey, noi abbiamo individuato un tipo specifico di rito come modello interpre-

⁽²⁵⁾ Cf. DESTRO – PESCE, «La lavanda dei piedi», 14-18; id., «L'iniziazione dei discepoli nel Vangelo di Giovanni», 57-62.

⁽²⁶⁾ Cf. DESTRO – PESCE, «La lavanda dei piedi», 18-23; id., «L'iniziazione dei discepoli nel Vangelo di Giovanni», 62-69.

⁽²⁷⁾ DESTRO – PESCE, «La lavanda dei piedi», 20; id., «L'iniziazione dei discepoli nel Vangelo di Giovanni», 65.

⁽²⁸⁾ J.H. NEYREY, «The Footwashing in John 13:6-11: Transformation Ritual or Ceremony», *The Social World of First Christians. Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks* (Eds. L.M. WHITE – O.L. YARBROUGH) (Minneapolis 1995) 198-213. In altra sede ci proponiamo di discutere questo saggio pubblicato nel momento in cui stavamo redigendo il nostro articolo uscito nel 1996. Il primo argomento di discussione sarebbe proprio la troppo netta distinzione tra rituale e cerimonia (è infatti impossibile che un rito, anche se ha le caratteristiche che Neyrey attribuisce alla «cerimonia», non abbia effetti trasformativi).

tativo della lavanda dei piedi in Gv 13, appunto il «rito di inversione», di cui J. Neyrey non parla.

La natura di rito di inversione di status deve essere ricordata qui perchè, alla fine del suo breve articolo del 1993, Jan Sammer suggerisce un parallelo tra Gv 13,1-20 e riti dei Saturnali di cui racconta Macrobio. Scrive Sammer: «As on other occasions, Jesus was portraying the new order that would prevail in the Kingdom of God that he was about to inaugurate — as was once true in the Kingdom of Saturn, there will be no distinction of master and slaves. The Romans used to celebrate their annual Saturnalia festival, held in memory of the long-gone Kingdom of Saturn, by having masters wait on their slaves at a celebratory feast (Macrobius, *Saturnalia*) in an effort to re-create, however briefly, the social conditions prevailing while Saturn was yet king. A new social order was also the basis of Jesus' concept of the Kingdom of God, of which the Last Supper was but a foretaste»⁽²⁹⁾.

Bisogna riconoscere a Sammer il merito di avere attirato l'attenzione, anche in questo caso, su un passo importante per illustrare la lavanda dei piedi di Giovanni. Ciò non toglie che l'utilizzazione che noi riteniamo corretto farne è abbastanza diversa da quella proposta da lui.

A questo scopo è bene ricordare i passi dei *Saturnalia* di Macrobio, a cui Sammer accenna senza però nè citarli, nè indicarli precisamente. Un primo passo è contenuto in *Saturnalia* I,7,26:

Regni eius tempora felicissima feruntur, cum propter rerum copiam, tum et quod nondum quisquam servitio vel libertate discriminabatur: quae res intellegi potest, quod Saturnalibus tota servis licentia permittitur⁽³⁰⁾.

Il brano contiene due diverse informazioni. La seconda riguarda un'usanza che Macrobio sembra considerare tuttora in vigore quando egli scrive (i *Saturnalia* sono databili intorno al 395 dell'Era Comune)⁽³¹⁾. Ai suoi tempi, una delle caratteristiche della festa era che gli schiavi godevano di libertà «totale»: *tota servis licentia permittitur*. La prima informazione, invece, consiste in una giustificazione teorica, quasi in una eziologia di questa usanza. Agli schiavi si concede libertà durante i Saturnali perchè nel regno di Saturno non c'era ancora la schiavitù (*quod nondum quisquam servitio vel libertate discriminabatur*). Questa spiegazione prodotta nel IV secolo, tuttavia, ci sembra meno importante della effettiva prassi della festa, che è molto antica.

Macrobio si dilunga poi sul tema della schiavitù da I,10,22 a I,11,50. Il passo che ci interessa è anzitutto quello di I,7,36-37 (ed è probabilmente a questo che Sammer fa riferimento, pur senza citarlo):

dall'esposizione delle cause a cui si ricollega l'origine di questa festa risulta evidente che i Saturnali sono più antichi della città di Roma,

⁽²⁹⁾ SAMMER, "Why Did Jesus Wash", 23.

⁽³⁰⁾ Macrobio Teodosio, *I saturnali* (N. MARINONE, a cura di) (UTET; Torino 1997; ristampa dell'edizione del 1967) 156-157.

⁽³¹⁾ N. MARINONE, "Introduzione" a *I saturnali* di Macrobio Teodosio (UTET; Torino 1997; ristampa dell'edizione del 1967) 22.

tanto che Lucio Accio negli *Annali* dice che prima di Roma questa solennità ebbe inizio in Grecia: “la maggior parte della Grecia, e soprattutto Atene, a Saturno celebra feste, che da loro sono denominate Cronie, e festeggiano quel giorno: per campi e per città quasi tutti banchettano in letizia e servono ciascuno i propri schiavi (*famulosque procurant quisque suos*), e tale costume passò di là ai nostri parimenti, sicché gli schiavi mangiano a tavola con i padroni (*ut cum domis famuli epulentur ibidem*)” (*Saturnalia* I,7,36-37)⁽³²⁾.

L'usanza è riportata anche in I,10,22:

Secondo Filocoro, Cecrope fu il primo ad innalzare un altare in Attica a Saturno ed a Opi; venerò questi Dèi come Giove e la terra e stabilì che, dopo il raccolto dei frutti e delle messi, i capi famiglia mangiassero insieme con gli schiavi con cui avevano diviso la fatica della coltivazione dei campi; il Dio infatti si compiaceva dell'onore reso agli schiavi in considerazione del lavoro compiuto (*delectari enim deum honore servorum, contemplatu laboris*)⁽³³⁾.

Da tutti questi passi risulta a) che agli schiavi durante le feste dei Saturnali veniva concesso un periodo limitato di libertà assoluta, b) che esisteva l'usanza che durante la festa gli schiavi mangiassero con i padroni e c) che durante il banchetto i padroni servissero gli schiavi.

In nessuno di questi passi si parla del *lavare i piedi* agli schiavi da parte dei padroni, bensì solo del *servire* dei padroni agli schiavi. Perciò il passo di Macrobio non è un parallelo a Gv 13,1-20. Semmai potrebbe essere addotto come parallelo di due passi del *Vangelo di Luca*. In 12,37 Luca scrive:

Beati quei servi che il padrone al suo ritorno troverà ancora svegli [...] egli si cingerà, li farà sdraiare e passerà a servirli.

Lc 22, 27, poi, riporta una parola di Gesù nell'ultima cena che — come si sa — potrebbe alludere ad una scena simile a quella di Gv 13,1-20:

Io sto in mezzo a voi come colui che serve.

Il punto fondamentale per noi è, però, un altro. Ciò che risulta chiaramente dai passi citati di Macrobio è che le feste dei Saturnali prevedevano un rito di inversione di status. Questo tipo di rito consiste nel fatto che *per un periodo limitato di tempo*, e cioè per la durata dell'azione rituale, viene concessa un'inversione di stato sociale. Ora è proprio questo che sembra accadere nei Saturnali: agli schiavi viene concesso l'esercizio di una libertà senza limiti, *Saturnalibus tota servis licentia permittitur*, e i padroni servono gli schiavi durante il banchetto. Gli schiavi, in altre parole, diventano padroni e viceversa, per un periodo limitato di tempo e sotto la protezione

⁽³²⁾ Macrobio Teodosio, *I saturnali*, 160-161.

⁽³³⁾ Macrobio Teodosio, *I saturnali*, 174-177. Cf. anche I,11,1: *quod servi cum dominis vescerentur* (ib., 176-177).

di un'azione rituale da tutti riconosciuta come tale. I riti di inversione di status hanno una complessa efficacia: rigenerazione sociale, immissione controllata di ideali egalitari, sfogo controllato di tensioni sociali, conferma dei ruoli tradizionali alla fine del rito. La festa dei Saturnali sembra sia stata diffusa sia in ambito romano sia in ambito greco da epoche molto antiche. Filocoro, a cui Macrobio attribuisce in I,10,22 la notizia circa il fatto che i padroni, durante la festa, mangiassero insieme con gli schiavi, è un autore greco del IV secolo prima dell'Era Comune. Lucio Flaccio, che parla della festa ad Atene in cui i padroni servono a tavola i propri schiavi, è un autore latino del II secolo prima dell'Era Comune (170-90 ca A.E.C). Ciò sta ad indicare che l'idea di un rito di inversione nel quale i padroni dovessero servire gli schiavi durante il pasto era diffuso nel mondo antico⁽³⁴⁾. Il Gesù di Giovanni ha conferito al gesto del lavaggio dei piedi da parte degli schiavi un significato tutto particolare, come abbiamo cercato di dimostrare nei nostri studi precedenti. Ma questo significato non è comprensibile se non sullo sfondo dei dati culturali della sua epoca. Questi passi di Macrobio possono, perciò, contribuire a capire meglio il rito di inversione che il Gesù di Giovanni ha creato.

Centro Interdipartimentale di Scienze delle religioni Mauro PESCE
Università di Bologna
Strada Maggiore 45, 40125 Bologna

Dipartimento di Studi Linguistici e Orientali Adriana DESTRO
Università di Bologna
Via Zamboni 16, 40126 Bologna

SUMMARY

The washing of the feet in John 13,1-20 is a ritual of inversion which transforms the ritual of receiving someone into one's home, carried out by slaves and common to many cultures in the ancient world, into a ritual of admission to discipleship. Aesop's Novel confirms that John 1,1-20 has to be set against the background of Graeco-Roman banqueting customs, especially as regards the slaves' function and the use of the linen cloth (λέντιον) for washing feet. A parallel to the ritual of inversion in John 13 may be found in the feast of Saturnalia during which masters served their own slaves at table.

⁽³⁴⁾ Ciò che Sammer afferma circa il «new social order» nel regno di Dio di cui l'ultima cena sarebbe anticipazione, ci sembra interessante. Tuttavia è scorretto ipotizzare un rapporto diretto tra gli ideali socio-religiosi del Gesù di Giovanni e il mito del regno di Saturno, senza la mediazione della cultura religiosa ebraico-palestinese. Al massimo si può ipotizzare una qualche eco dell'utopia socio-religiosa del giubileo levitico (che prevede la liberazione degli schiavi e il ritorno dei debitori nei propri possedimenti), il quale a sua volta potrebbe avere qualche coincidenza con il mito del regno di Saturno. Sugli ideali del giubileo levitico in Gesù rimandiamo a M. PESCE – A. DESTRO, "La remissione dei peccati nell'escatologia di Gesù", *Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi* 16/1 (1999).

Die Liebe von David und Jonatan als Frage der modernen Exegese

I

Im Gefolge der westeuropäischen und nordamerikanischen Diskussion über Homosexualität und die Berechtigung der homosexuellen Lebensweise der gleichgeschlechtlich orientierten Menschen haben auch die biblischen Texte, die zu dieser Problematik zumindest scheinbar beitragen, zunehmend Interesse erweckt⁽¹⁾. Neben den wenigen biblischen Texten, in denen auf irgendeine Weise auf gleichgeschlechtlichen Umgang ablehnend hingedeutet wird (Gen 19,1-11; Lev 18,22; 20,13; Ri 19), gibt es einen, der eine gleichgeschlechtliche Beziehung mit großer Sympathie beschreibt, nämlich die Aufstiegsgeschichte Davids, in der die liebevolle Freundschaft von David und Jonatan, Sohn des Königs Saul, bisweilen als homosexuell geprägt verstanden worden ist (1 Sam 18-20; 2 Sam 1)⁽²⁾.

Während die Beziehung von David und Jonatan meist eher als eine nahe Freundschaft⁽³⁾ denn als eine homosexuelle Beziehung angesehen worden ist, haben jüngst Silvia Schroer und Thomas Staubli wieder die These vertreten, es handele sich um ein ausgesprochen homosexuelles Verhältnis: "Die Beziehung zwischen David und Jonatan war eine homoerotische und sehr wahrscheinlich auch homosexuelle Beziehung"⁽⁴⁾.

(¹) Von der schon groß gewachsenen Menge der einschlägigen Literatur seien hier besonders die Monographien von J. BOSWELL, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality. Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago – London 1980); R. SCROGGS, *The New Testament and Homosexuality. Contextual Background for Contemporary Debate* (Philadelphia 1983); B. BROOTEN, *Love between Women. Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* (Chicago – London 1996) und D.J. WOLD, *Out of Order. Homosexuality in the Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Grand Rapids 1998) sowie die von J.S. SIKER, *Homosexuality in the Church. Both Sides of the Debate* (Louisville 1994); C.-L. SEOW, *Homosexuality and Christian Community* (Louisville 1996) und R.L. BRAWLEY, *Biblical Ethics and Homosexuality. Listening to the Scripture* (Louisville 1996) herausgegebenen Sammelbände erwähnt; vgl. auch M. NISSINEN, *Homoeroticism in the Biblical World. A Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis 1998).

(²) So z.B. T. HORNER, *Jonatan Loved David. Homosexuality in Biblical Times* (Philadelphia 1978) 26-39; D.M. GUNN, *The Fate of King Saul* (JSOTSS 14; Sheffield 1980) 93; S. TERRIEN, *Till the Heart Sings. A Biblical Theology of Manhood and Womanhood* (Philadelphia 1985) 169; in gewissem Sinne auch E.S. GERSTENBERGER, *Das dritte Buch Mose: Leviticus* (ATD 6; Göttingen 1993) 271.

(³) So z.B. P.K. MCCARTER, *I Samuel. A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (AB 8; Garden City 1980) 342; F. STOLZ, *Das erste und zweite Buch Samuel* (ZBK; Zürich 1981); S.B. PARKER, "The Hebrew Bible and Homosexuality", *QR* 11 (1991) 4-19, bes. 10-11; W. DIETRICH, *Die frühe Königszeit in Israel. 10. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 3; Stuttgart 1993) 291-292.

(⁴) S. SCHROER – T. STAUBLI, "Saul, David und Jonatan — eine Dreiecksgeschichte? Ein Beitrag zum Thema 'Homosexualität im Ersten Testament'", *BK* 51 (1996) 15-22, bes. 15.

Diese These hat wiederum Markus Zehnder angegriffen in einem Artikel, in dem er die Argumente von Schroer und Staubli eines nach dem anderen hinfällig zu machen versucht⁽⁵⁾.

Bei der Interpretation des Geschlechtlichen in biblischen und anderen zeitgenössischen Quellen steht man stets vor der Gefahr, sich von den in der modernen Begrifflichkeit implizierten Gesellschaftsstrukturen und der Sexualkultur des 20. Jahrhunderts verleiten zu lassen. Im Falle von David und Jonatan dreht sich das Problem um den Begriff 'Homosexualität', über dessen Bedeutung keine Einigkeit besteht, der aber in dem modernen Sprachgebrauch allgemein und ohne nähere Bestimmungen als Bezeichnung gleichgeschlechtlicher Beziehungen verwendet wird. Auch bei Schroer und Staubli ist, ebenso wenig wie bei Zehnder, eine Erläuterung des Begriffs nicht vorhanden. In dem obigen Zitat von Schroer und Staubli wird zwar ein Unterschied zwischen "homöerotischen" und "homo-sexuellen" Beziehungen gemacht, aber die Unterscheidung bleibt unpräzisiert. Zehnder wiederum spricht pauschal von Homosexualität bzw. homosexuellen Beziehungen und Aktivitäten und hält es für wichtig, "den Unterschied zwischen nicht-sexuellen und sexuellen freundschaftlichen Beziehungen im Auge zu behalten"⁽⁶⁾, was wohl so zu verstehen sein dürfte, daß das Wort Homosexualität nur in dem Falle am Platze sei, wenn es sich um eine sexuelle Beziehung handelt — aber was macht denn eine Beziehung "sexuell"?

Nicht nur die schwankende Semantik des Begriffs Homosexualität, sondern vor allem dessen letztendliche Abhängigkeit von der modernen westlichen Interpretation des Geschlechts haben zur Folge, daß es inzwischen durchaus fraglich geworden ist, ob von einer von Zeit und Kultur unabhängigen Homosexualität überhaupt die Rede sein kann⁽⁷⁾. Während es indes unbestreitbar ist, daß gleichgeschlechtliche Beziehungen verschiedener Art weltweit und in allen Zeiten zu beobachten sind, bewerten verschiedene Gesellschaften und Kulturen die mannigfachen Formen gleichgeschlechtlichen Verhaltens nicht in gleicher Weise. Was man heute Homosexualität nennt, ist kein Ding an sich, sondern eine auf moderner Wissenschaft beruhende und von dem Oberbegriff "Sexualität" abhängige generalisierende Kategorie, die die Idee einer persönlichen Orientation und des daraus entstehenden Bedürfnisses zum gleichgeschlechtlichen sexuellen Verhalten impliziert. Wird also das Wort in der Interpretation der Quellen der prämodernen Welt verwendet, muß dies in vollem Bewußtsein dessen gemacht werden, daß der Begriff diesen Quellen grundsätzlich fremd, in unserem Sprachgebrauch aber durch die seit dem 19. Jh. entwickelten medizinischen, psychologischen, soziologischen und anthropologischen Konnotationen bestimmt ist.

⁽⁵⁾ M. ZEHNDER, "Exegetische Beobachtungen zu den David-Jonatan-Geschichten", *Bib* 79 (1998) 153-179.

⁽⁶⁾ ZEHNDER, "Beobachtungen", 178.

⁽⁷⁾ Die Problematisierung des Begriffs verdankt sich vor allem dem Werk von M. FOUCAULT, *Histoire de la sexualité*, Vol. I: *La Volonté de savoir* (Paris 1976). Vgl. D.M. HALPERIN, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love* (New York – London 1990). Auch ZEHNDER, "Beobachtungen", 167 (Anm. 39) zeigt, daß er sich dieser Schwierigkeiten bewußt ist, aber dies scheint wenig Konsequenzen für seinen Gebrauch des Begriffs Homosexualität zu haben.

Wird also der Begriff Homosexualität in Beziehung auf die David-Jonatan-Szenen gebraucht, müßte zunächst einmal geklärt werden, was erforderlich ist, um die Beziehung dieser beiden Männer sachgerecht als homosexuell bezeichnen zu können. Welche Eigenschaften der Beziehung werden betont? Die persönliche sexuelle Orientierung der Beteiligten, oder aber ihr konkretes Verhalten, oder beides? Wenn es nicht um die Ausrichtung, sondern nur um das Verhalten geht, welche Formen des gleichgeschlechtlichen Verhaltens sind denn als (homo)sexuell zu bezeichnen — alle Ausdrücke der Zärtlichkeit und Begierde, oder nur intime physische Berührung, oder ausschließlich die sexuelle Vereinigung? Kann das Wort nur auf die Beziehung zwischen den beiden Männern bezogen werden, oder spielt dabei notwendig auch die gesellschaftliche Bewertung dieser Beziehung mit; m.a.W., gibt es eine Homosexualität ohne die gesellschaftliche Auslegung des Verhaltens der Beteiligten? Wer braucht eine Antwort auf die Frage, ob die Beziehung von David und Jonatan homosexuell war? Warum wird diese Frage überhaupt gestellt? Diese Fragen sind keine Haarspalterei, wenn wir nach der Anwendbarkeit des Begriffs Homosexualität auf die Quellen der alten Welt ernstlich fragen.

II

Unabhängig von der Datierung der Aufstiegsgeschichte Davids dürfen wir davon ausgehen, daß sie ein literarisches Werk ist, das seine Entstehung einer oder wohl mehrerer Bearbeiter verdankt, deren Erzählintentionen es folgt und deswegen nur äußerst beschränkt, wenn überhaupt, einen Zugang zu konkreten geschichtlichen Verhältnissen ermöglicht. Deswegen können die historischen Gestalten David und Jonatan nicht unter die Lupe genommen werden; es geht bei der Interpretation ihrer Beziehung nicht um Geschichtsauslegung, sondern um Lesen und Verstehen der Erzählung. Dabei richtet sich die moderne Leserschaft nach der modernen Begrifflichkeit, was mit der Textwelt nicht immer im Einklang steht und deswegen etwa die Unterscheidung zwischen Sexuellem und Nicht-Sexuellem in dem erzählten Stoff schwierig macht.

Es fehlt nicht an Liebesausdrücken in den David-Jonatan-Szenen: sowohl die Wortfamilie אָהַב 'lieben' ⁽⁸⁾ als auch andere Ausdrücke für persönliche Zuneigung und Hingabe wie חָפֵץ 'Gefallen haben' (1 Sam 19,1), נָעַם 'lieb(lich) sein' (2 Sam 1,26), שָׁבַע 'schwören' (1 Sam 20,3.17.42) und קָשַׁר ni. 'sich binden' (1 Sam 18,1) werden zur Beschreibung ihres Verhältnisses benutzt. Außerdem wird erzählt, daß sie beim Abschied weinen und einander küssen (נָשַׁק 1 Sam 20,41). Im Gebrauch von diesen und anderen Ausdrücken haben Schroer und Staubli Anspielungen auf die Sprache des Hohenliedes gefunden ⁽⁹⁾.

⁽⁸⁾ Das Verb אָהַב kommt in 1 Sam 18,1; 20,17, das Nomen אֹהֲבָה in 1 Sam 18,3; 20,17; 2 Sam 1,26 vor.

⁽⁹⁾ SCHROER – STAUBLI, "Saul, David und Jonatan", 18-19: neben אָהַב + נָפֶשׁ (Hld 1,7; 3,1-4), שָׁבַע (Hld 2,7; 8,4) und נָעַם (Hld 1,16; 7,7) und נָשַׁק (Hld 1,2 u.a.) auch das "Gehen aufs Feld" (1 Sam 20,11 vgl. Hld 7,12). ZEHNDRER, "Beobachtungen", 178, erklärt diesen Sachverhalt umgekehrt so, daß "der (oder die) Verfasser des Hohenliedes

Im Zusammenhang mit den David-Jonatan-Szenen entkräftet Zehnder die erotische Bedeutung der Wortfamilie אהב und anderer Liebesausdrücke insofern, als nicht nur die sexuelle Komponente verschwindet, sondern auch die persönliche, emotionale Nähe zwischen David und Jonatan, wenn nicht ganz und gar bestritten, so doch erheblich ausgedünnt wird und die Liebe eher als Ausdruck einer theologisch-politischen Korrektheit erscheint⁽¹⁰⁾. Dabei schlosse die theologische Motivation den eventuellen homosexuellen Aspekt der Beziehung als unvereinbar mit der offiziellen JHWH-Religion automatisch aus.

Daß mit dem Verb אהב und mit seinen Derivaten zumeist andere als gleichgeschlechtliche Beziehungen beschrieben werden, und zwar oft ohne ausgeprägt erotische Konnotation, ist ohnehin klar. Ferner kommt es aus dem altorientalischen und biblischen — insbesondere aus dem deuteronom(ist)ischen — Schrifttum deutlich zum Vorschein, daß das Liebesvokabular nicht nur in bezug auf erotisch-sexuelle Liebe, sondern häufig auch auf andere zwischenmenschliche oder menschlich-göttliche Beziehungen verwendet wird⁽¹¹⁾. Dies erklärt sich wohl daraus, daß die Liebessprache einer nahen Verbindung und Hingabe, einer Devotion des Menschen für den/die Geliebte(n), den Bundesgenossen, oder Gott selbst, bestmöglich Ausdruck zu geben vermag⁽¹²⁾, und deswegen auch oft in Zusammenhängen dienstbar gemacht wird, wo der Erotik keine besondere Rolle zukommt. Hier verdient allerdings Beachtung, daß die erotische Sprache auch im politisch-theologischen Kontext von ihrer erotischen Bedeutung notwendig nichts einbüßt, wie besonders die Metaphorik der prophetischen Bücher Hosea, Jeremia und Ezechiel deutlich genug zeigt. Auch in einem Falle wie in dem von David und Jonatan darf man sich fragen, ob die politisch-theologischen und erotisch-emotionalen Aspekte der Liebesausdrücke sich unbedingt gegenseitig ausschließen müssen.

diejenige Geschichte aus der religiösen Überlieferung Israels, die am ausführlichsten ein inniges Freundschaftsverhältnis beschreibt, an einigen Punkten als literarische Vorlagen verwendet hat (bzw. haben)". Angesichts der weiten Verbreitung der verblüffend ähnlichen Liebesmetaphorik im östlichen Mittelmeerraum in verschiedenen Epochen (s. M. NISSINEN, "Love Lyrics of Nabû and Tašmetu: An Assyrian Song of Songs?", *Und Mose schrieb dieses Lied auf*. Festschrift für O. Loretz. [Hrsg. M. DIETRICH – I. KOTTSEPER] [AOAT 250; Münster 1998] 585-634) ist die Annahme eines innerbiblischen literarischen Abhängigkeitsverhältnisses nicht notwendig.

⁽¹⁰⁾ ZEHLER, "Beobachtungen", 173-174; ähnlich schon J.A. THOMPSON, "The Significance of the Verb *Love* in the Jonathan-David Narratives in 1 Samuel", *VT* 24 (1974) 34-38; McCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 305, 342; DERS., *II Samuel*. A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary (AB 9; Garden City 1984) 77.

⁽¹¹⁾ S. nach wie vor W.L. MORAN, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy", *CBQ* 25 (1963) 77-87 mit Hinweis auf den Bund zwischen David und Jonatan (82, Anm. 33). Zur Semantik des alttestamentlichen Liebesvokabulars s. grundlegend R. LAUHA, *Psychophysischer Sprachgebrauch im Alten Testament*. Eine Struktursemantische Analyse von אהב, נפש, רוח (AASF B Diss 35; Helsinki 1983) 170-191 und vgl. auch A. BRENNER, *The Intercourse of Knowledge*. On Gendering Desire and 'Sexuality' in the Hebrew Bible (Biblical Interpretation Series 26; Leiden 1997) 13-21.

⁽¹²⁾ Vgl. W.G. LAMBERT, "Devotion: The Languages of Religion and Love", *Figurative Language in the Ancient Near East* (Hrsg. M. MINDLIN – M. GELLER – J.E. WINSBROUGH) (London 1987) 25-39; NISSINEN, "Love Lyrics", 599-600.

Indes betont Zehnder mit Recht, daß das Verhältnis von David und Jonatan in den Zusammenhang der Aufstiegsgeschichte Davids gehört, dem die einzelnen Beschreibungen dieser Beziehung untergeordnet sind, und macht deutlich, daß die Erzählintention nicht in erster Linie romantisch orientiert ist⁽¹³⁾. Daß die Liebe dieser Männer einen wichtigen Teilaspekt, aber doch nicht das Hauptthema der Erzählung bildet und demnach nicht eingehender dargestellt ist, macht die Frage nach dem "eigentlichen" Charakter dieser Freundschaft umso schwieriger zu beantworten. Immerhin braucht die Tatsache, daß die verstreuten Szenen zwischen David und Jonatan einem größeren erzählerischen Zweck dienen, die Intensität ihrer Beziehung nicht geringer zu machen und setzt auch nicht a priori voraus, daß ihre emotionalen, ja erotischen Dimensionen deswegen zurückgestellt werden müßten.

Interessanterweise ist in der Redaktion der Aufstiegsgeschichte Davids keine Tendenz bemerkbar, die Innigkeit der Freundschaft zu verschleiern. Wenn die Erzählung von dem feierlichen Bund zwischen Jonatan und David mit Beteuerung der Liebe Jonatans für David (1 Sam 20,12-17) zu einer jüngeren Schicht gehört und das gleiche auch für die Küssen- und Weinenszene beim Abschied der Männer (1 Sam 20,40-42) gilt⁽¹⁴⁾, so stellt es sich heraus, daß die Bearbeiter im Gegenteil das Verhältnis intensivieren lassen, ohne dabei ein Problem zu sehen. Das gleiche läßt sich auch in dem Klagelied Davids nach dem Tode Sauls und Jonatans (1 Sam 1,19-27) ahnen, denn in diesem Lied, das im großen und ganzen aus regelrecht gestalteten poetischen Einheiten besteht, hebt sich ein Stück hervor, wo die sonst durchsichtige poetische Struktur abbricht, und zwar in den uns besonders interessierenden Versen 25-27:

²⁵Wie sind die Helden gefallen
inmitten des Krieges!

[Jonatan ist erschlagen auf deinen Höhen.

²⁶Ich bin bedrückt deinetwegen, mein Bruder Jonatan!

Du warst mir sehr lieb,

deine Liebe war mir wunderbarer als die Liebe der Frauen.]

²⁷Wie sind die Helden gefallen
und die Streitwaffen verlorengegangen!

Das Zwischenstück (Vss. 25b-26), dessen poetische Struktur im Gegensatz zum sonstigen Text weitgehend unklar ist, drängt sich deutlich zwischen zwei parallele Bikola — oder inmitten eines Tetrakolons — und erklärt sich wohl am besten als eine nachträgliche Interpretation, die die erste Zeile des Gedichts (V. 19a) aufgreift, צִבִּי ("Zierde" oder "Gazelle")⁽¹⁵⁾ als

⁽¹³⁾ ZEHNDER, "Beobachtungen", 168-174; zur Intention der David-Saul-Erzählungen auch DIETRICH, *Die frühe Königszeit*, 213-220.

⁽¹⁴⁾ S.T. VEIJOLA, *Die ewige Dynastie*. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung (AASF B 193; Helsinki 1975) 82-84.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Oder: die Gazelle (II צִבִּי); s. H.-P. MÜLLER, "Gilgameschs Trauerlied um Enkidu und die Gattung der Totenklage", ZA 68 (1978) 233-250, 239. Stimmt diese Übersetzung, so gilt das Wort als ein weiteres gemeinsames Element der David-Jonatan-Szenen mit dem Hohenlied (Hld 2,9.17; 8,14; vgl. צִבִּי Hld 2,7; 3,5; 4,5; 7,4).

Bezeichnung für Jonatan auslegt und die Liebe Davids zu Jonatan im Geist der David-Jonatan-Szenen besonders hervorhebt.

Die redaktionsgeschichtlichen Beobachtungen dienen nicht dem Zweck, den Ruhm des "historischen" David vor dem Verdacht eines homosexuellen Verhaltens zu bewahren. Vielmehr gelten sie als zusätzliches Beispiel dafür, daß die Bearbeiter der Aufstiegsgeschichte Davids offenbar keine Hemmungen hatten, die Beziehung von David und Jonatan ausgesprochen als Liebesverhältnis darzustellen.

Es verdient indes Beachtung, daß im älteren Bestand des Liedes *Saul* und Jonatan ebenso als "geliebte" oder gar "Liebende" vorgestellt werden (V. 23). Möglicherweise wird dies durch die Bemerkung in den Vss. 25b-26 von der schon bekannten Liebe zwischen David und Jonatan ergänzt, um damit die "Dreiecksgeschichte" dieser drei komplett zu machen; hier erhebt sich aber zugleich die Frage nach der Natur der Liebe oder Eifersucht, an der auch Vater und Sohn beteiligt sind. Denn auch Saul hat in den David-Jonatan-Szenen eine entscheidende Rolle zu spielen⁽¹⁶⁾. Jonatan hätte David nie kennengelernt, hätte Saul ihn nicht zu sich als seinen Musiktherapeuten und Waffenträger berufen und ihn "sehr lieb" gewonnen (וַיֵּדָבְרוּ בֵּין 1 Sam 16,21). Seitdem leidet die Liebe von David und Jonatan unter dem Schatten des Saul und seiner Eifersucht.

Die David-Erzählungen geben durchweg den Eindruck eines Liebe-und-Haß-Verhaltens des Saul zu David, dessen Freundschaft mit seinem Sohn ihm nicht gefällt und geradezu zu aggressiven Gefühlsausbrüchen Anlaß gibt, wie zum Aufbrausen des Saul am Tisch beim Neumond: "Du Bastard einer zuchtvergessenen Frau (נְעוּת הַמְרֹדֶת)!"⁽¹⁷⁾. Als ob ich nicht wüßte, daß du den Sohn Isais erkoren hast (כִּי בָחַר אִתּוֹ לְבִן יִשָּׁי), dir und der Scham deiner Mutter (עֶרְוַת אִמִּךָ) zur Schande! Denn solange der Sohn Isais lebt auf der Erde, wirst du und dein Königtum nicht bestehen. Sende hin und laß ihn herholen zu mir! Er ist ein Kind des Todes" (1 Sam 20,30-31.). "Halluzinationen eines Psychotikers oder Hellsicht eines seelisch Verwundeten?", fragt Walter Dietrich und deutet damit darauf hin, daß dieser vieldeutige Ausbruch mehr als eine bloße Obszönität enthält⁽¹⁸⁾. Die politischen Motive von Saul, das Verhältnis von David zu seinem Sohn zu verdammen, sind explizite ausgedrückt. David gilt als ein Thronprätendent, dessen Freundschaft sich für den Erbsohn als verhängnisvoll erweisen wird — aber nicht nur das: David ist auch derjenige, mit dem Saul selbst einmal eine liebevolle Beziehung gehabt hatte. Die entfernende Rede von "dem Sohn Isais" sowie das Todesurteil sind wohl gemeint als Zeichen eines verfolgungswahnsinnigen Hasses gegen David, den er doch zugleich immer noch von Herzen liebt (vgl. 1 Sam 24,17-22; 26,17-25) und deswegen auf seinen Sohn eifersüchtig ist, dem es gelungen ist, sich mit David anzufreunden, oder ihn zu "erküren" (בָּחַר) — ein Ausdruck eines festen Verhältnisses, der in den Mund des Saul wohl bewußt statt "lieben" (אַהֲבָה) gelegt worden ist.

⁽¹⁶⁾ S. SCHROER – STAUBLI, "Saul, David und Jonatan", 17-18; DIETRICH, *Die frühe Königszeit*, 49-52, 62-67.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Zu dieser Übersetzung s. H.J. STOEBE, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT VIII 1; Gütersloh 1973) 378-379.

⁽¹⁸⁾ DIETRICH, *Die frühe Königszeit*, 52.

Im Munde des Saul macht das Verhältnis Jonatans mit David sogar die Genitalien seiner Mutter zuschanden. Die Rede von "Scham" (ערודה) führt die Gedanken geradewegs zu Lev 18 und 20, wo das "Entblößen der Scham" (גלה ערוה) für Geschlechtsverkehr steht (Lev 18,6-23; 20,11-14.), und legt den Gedanken nahe, daß der Erzähler den wütenden Saul das Verhältnis seines Sohnes mit David auch im sexuellen Sinne blamieren läßt. Das "Entblößen der Scham" wird von inzestuösem Geschlechtsverkehr mit den zur Großfamilie gehörenden Frauen gebraucht, und zwar als eine Verletzung der Ehre der Männer dieser Frauen, denen die dadurch verursachte Schande zukommt. Es ist bemerkenswert, daß Saul sich gerade hier um die Ehre der Mutter Jonatans sorgt, die er selbst doch gleich entehrend "eine zuchtvergessene Frau" genannt hat⁽¹⁹⁾ und mit der David wohl keine Beziehung hat⁽²⁰⁾. Der Sprachgebrauch des Saul gilt kaum als Zeugnis einer "homosexuellen" Beziehung zwischen den beiden, läßt aber eindeutig verstehen, daß Jonatan mit seiner Beziehung zu David, der trotz allem immer noch zum engsten Kreis von Saul gehört, den Bereich seines Vaters politisch wie persönlich betritt. Deswegen ist die Innigkeit dieser Beziehung für Saul in jeder Hinsicht bedrohlich.

III

Daß es sich im Falle von David und Jonatan schwerlich um eine homosexuelle Beziehung handeln könne, erklärt sich nach Zehnder aus der einstimmig ablehnenden Haltung der hebräischen Bibel gegenüber dem homosexuellen Verhalten⁽²¹⁾. Dagegen betonen Schroer und Staubli, daß bestimmte Formen gleichgeschlechtlichen Umgangs zwar abgelehnt worden seien, ohne daß die einschlägigen Texte gegen jede Art gleichgeschlechtlicher Beziehungen gerichtet wären⁽²²⁾. Schließt also die Ablehnung des homosexuellen Vergewaltigungsversuchs (Gen 19,1-11 und Ri 19) und das Verbot bei einem Mann "wie bei einer Frau" zu schlafen (Lev 18,22; 20,13), jede homoerotische Interpretation der David-Jonatan-Szenen notwendig aus? M.a.W.: Sollte das Verhalten von David und Jonatan tatsächlich als homosexuell verstanden werden, müßte es dann zugleich auf derselben Ebene mit dem in Gen 19,1-11, Ri 19 und Lev 18,22; 20,13 abgelehnten sexuellen Umgang als eine weitere Erscheinung der allgemeinen, in allen Texten in Erscheinung tretenden 'Homosexualität' gleichgestellt werden?

⁽¹⁹⁾ McCARTER, *I Samuel*, 343, meint zwar, daß diese Beleidigung nur an Jonatan und nicht an seine Mutter gerichtet ist und daß der Hinweis auf die Genitalien seiner Mutter ihn als ein von Anfang an mißbratenes Kind hinstellt: "Jonathan, says Saul, has disgraced his mother's genitals, whence he came forth".

⁽²⁰⁾ H. SEEBASS, "בִּישׁ", *TWAT* I, 568-580; bes. 572, meint, David hätte als König mit dem königlichen Harem auch die Mutter Jonatans als sein Weib übernehmen können.

⁽²¹⁾ ZEHNDER, "Beobachtungen", 174: "Wie sollte es möglich sein, daß ausgerechnet JHWH zum Zeugen und Garanten eines Bundes gemacht wird, wenn dieser Bund mit einer Art von sexueller Beziehung verbunden wäre, für deren Bejahung jedes positive Zeugnis innerhalb der JHWH-Religion fehlt, für deren Ablehnung aber — wenn auch in der Datierung umstrittene — Zeugnisse vorliegen?"

⁽²²⁾ SCHROER — STAUBLI, "Saul, David und Jonatan", 16-17.

Die Erzählungen über Sodom (Gen 19,1-11) und Gibeon (Ri 19) berichten über kollektive Vergewaltigungsversuche, die deutlich keiner homosexuellen Orientation, sondern einer durch eine Aggression ausgedrückten Xenophobie Ausdruck geben⁽²³⁾. In diesen Fällen handelt es sich um eine maskuline Machtdemonstration, die dem Zweck dient, die andere Partei mittels sexueller Gewalt zu unterwerfen.

Als Ursache und Motivation der Bestimmungen des Heiligkeitgesetzes in Lev 18,22 und 20,13 wird von den heutigen Forschern die allgemeine Ablehnung der sog. Homosexualität⁽²⁴⁾ oder differenziertere Anlässe, wie numinose Furcht und dämonische Ängste verbunden mit uralten Reinheits- und Tabuvorschriften⁽²⁵⁾, Assoziation des gleichgeschlechtlichen Umgangs mit fremden Kulturen und deren angeblich homosexuellen Praktiken⁽²⁶⁾, Verschwendung des Samens⁽²⁷⁾, Verletzung der Reinheitsvorschriften durch Vermischung von Samen und Exkrement⁽²⁸⁾ oder Übertretung der Grenzen der männlichen Menschenklasse⁽²⁹⁾ verstanden. Unabhängig davon, wie man die Ursache dieser Vorschriften definiert, ist in ihnen eine bestimmte Interpretation des Geschlechts zu erkennen, deren Grundlegung die tabuisierte und von der Gemeinschaft kontrollierte Unterscheidung zwischen Frauen- und Männerrollen bzw. passiven und aktiven Sexualrollen bildet⁽³⁰⁾.

Es wird in Lev 18,22, ebenso wenig wie in 20,13, kein Wort von Frauen geäußert, was durch die Definition der männlichen Homoerotik völlig verständlich wird: "Du sollst nicht bei einem Mann wie bei einer Frau schlafen" (וְאִישׁ לֹא תִשְׁכַּב בְּמִשְׁכְּבִי אִשָּׁה); es wird also hier die sexuelle Vereinigung (מִשְׁכָּב vgl. Jes 57,7f.; Ez 16,16f.; 23,17) zweier Menschen

⁽²³⁾ Diese schon fast als *communis opinio* geltende Auffassung hat neulich WOLD, *Out of Order*, 77-89, widerlegt mit dem Argument, das Verb יָדַע werde in Gen 19,5, gegen etwa BOSWELL, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 94, in einem eindeutig sexuellen Sinne benutzt, was wiederum bedeute, daß die Spitze der Erzählung nicht gegen die Ungastlichkeit, sondern gegen Homosexualität gerichtet sei. Das Wesentliche dabei ist allerdings nicht die sexuelle Bedeutung des Verbs יָדַע, die wohl keinem Zweifel unterliegt (s. z.B. NISSINEN, *Homoeroticism*, 46), sondern die Motivation und der Zweck der Tat, die mit diesem Verb ausgedrückt wird und die doch unbestreitbar als haarsträubendes Beispiel der Unfreundlichkeit gegenüber den Fremden vorgestellt wird. So ist es auch in der innerbiblischen Interpretation der Erzählung verstanden worden (Ez 16,49; Weish 19,13-15; Lk 10,12; Mt 10,15). Das eigentliche Problem ist somit nicht die Bedeutung des hebräischen Verbs, sondern der "heterosexistische" Gebrauch des Wortes Homosexualität als Oberbegriff für alle mögliche Gleichgeschlechtlichkeit (s. P.B. JUNG – R.F. SMITH, *Heterosexism: An Ethical Challenge*. [Albany 1993] 65-71).

⁽²⁴⁾ WOLD, *Out of Order*, 117-120.

⁽²⁵⁾ E. GERSTENBERGER, *Das dritte Buch Mose*, 232,271; vgl. DERS., "Homosexualität im Alten Testament — Geschichte und Bewertungen", *Schwule, Lesben... — Kirche: Homosexualität und kirchliches Handeln* (EKHN-Dokumentation 2; Frankfurt a.M. 1996) 137.

⁽²⁶⁾ BOSWELL, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 100-101.

⁽²⁷⁾ H. EILBERG-SCHWARZ, *The Savage in Judaism*. An Anthropology of Israelite Religion and Ancient Judaism (Bloomington 1990) 183.

⁽²⁸⁾ S. OLYAN, "And with a Male You Shall Not Lie the Lying Down of a Woman": On the Meaning and Significance of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13", *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 5 (1994) 179-206, bes. 203.

⁽²⁹⁾ M. DOUGLAS, *Purity and Danger*. An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo (London 1966) 41-57.

⁽³⁰⁾ Vgl. NISSINEN, *Homoeroticism*, 43-44.

männlichen Geschlechts verboten. Weil diese Vereinigung wiederum wohl nur als ein penetrativer Akt vorstellbar ist, wie der Ausdruck *משכב זכר* — die weiblich-passive Entsprechung für *משכבי אשה* —, der das Ende der Jungfräulichkeit markiert (Num 31,17-18.35 und Ri 21,11-12), eindeutig zeigt⁽³¹⁾, wird man schließen müssen, daß der eigentliche Gegenstand von Lev 18,22 und 20,13 der einzig mögliche Akt von dieser Art, wenn es sich um zwei Männer handelt, nämlich der anale ist⁽³²⁾. Dabei wird explizite vorausgesetzt, daß die andere, d.h. die passive, Partei die Rolle der Frau spielt. Auch in diesem Fall haben wir es also nicht mit allen beliebigen gleichgeschlechtlichen Beziehungen zu tun⁽³³⁾, von Gesinnungen und Begehren ganz zu schweigen, sondern ausdrücklich mit Taten, *משכבי אשה*, durch die männliche Mitglieder der Gesellschaft mit einer Frauenrolle versehen und somit entehrt werden. Es handelt sich um *רועבה*, um eine Verletzung einer heiligen Grenze zwischen den männlichen und weiblichen Geschlechts- und Sexualrollen⁽³⁴⁾.

Keiner von den wenigen einschlägigen Belegen in der hebräischen Bibel kann also als eine allgemeine Stellungnahme zur "Homosexualität" ausgelegt werden, auch nicht als "Ablehnung jeder Art homosexuellen Verhaltens" trotz des einstimmig negativen Befunds. Denn es geht in keiner von diesen Stellen um alle Arten gleichgeschlechtlichen Verhaltens, die dem modernen Leser vorstellbar sind, denn jeder Text hat jeweils sein eigenes Anliegen. Da die Texte allesamt von Mißhandlungen und Schändungen männlicher Ehre handeln, gibt es keinen Anlaß, die geschilderten Erscheinungen des gleichgeschlechtlichen Umgangs positiv zu bewerten. Keiner von ihnen rechnet mit einer gegenseitigen Liebe ebenbürtiger Menschen gleichen Geschlechts ohne die Rollenverteilung in die aktive und passive. Eine solche Beziehung, wenn überhaupt vorstellbar, ist auch nirgendwo verboten.

IV

Wie spiegelt sich nun das in den biblischen Quellen befindliche Verständnis der gleichgeschlechtlichen Verhältnisse in den David-Jonatan-Szenen wider? Es ist wohl davon auszugehen, daß wo keiner mit dem heterosexuellen Geschlechtsverkehr vergleichbare Akt stattfindet, man auch mit keinen unzulässigen Grenzüberschreitungen zu rechnen braucht, also keine *רועבה* stattfindet. Dies bedeutet, daß gegenseitige Emotionen und die damit eventuell verbundene physische Nähe zwischen Personen gleichen Geschlechts (lies: Männern; von Frauen ist ja niemals die Rede) überhaupt kaum in den Geltungsbereich der Vorschriften des Heiligkeitgesetzes fallen, und daß die Verfasser der Aufstiegsgeschichte samt ihren Leser/innen demnach keine Schwierigkeiten hatten, das Verhältnis von David und Jonatan als Liebe zu bezeichnen und die physischen Ausdrücke dieser Liebe zu schildern. Offenbar gehörten sie zum Bereich eines gesellschaftlich tolerierten Verhaltens.

⁽³¹⁾ Zu dieser Terminologie s. BRENNER, *The Intercourse of Knowledge*, 24-26.

⁽³²⁾ S. dazu OLYAN, "And with a Male", 183-186.

⁽³³⁾ S. auch GERSTENBERGER, "Homosexualität", 139-140.

⁽³⁴⁾ Zu *רועבה* in diesem Sinne s. OLYAN, "And with a Male", 180, 199.

Das Fehlen der in der altorientalischen Sexualkultur sonst üblichen Rollenverteilung hängt wohl damit zusammen, daß die Geschichte von David und Jonatan, wie die David-Erzählungen überhaupt, ausdrücklich eine Männergeschichte ist, in der die Ehre eines Mannes ein hervorragendes Anliegen ist, denen die Rolle der Frauen, wenn auch erzählerisch unübersehbar⁽³⁷⁾, jedoch untergeordnet bleibt⁽³⁸⁾. Betrachtet man die Männerliebe vor diesem Hintergrund, so erscheint sie als ein Ausdruck zwischenmännlicher Kultur, die Frauen gewissermaßen ausschließt oder zur Seite drängt. Eben in dieser Kultur kann Männerliebe als Liebe von Ebenbürtigen als "wunderbarer" als Frauenliebe empfunden werden. Der maskuline Zusammenschluß, oder "male bonding", schließt nicht nur seelische Sympathie, sondern auch eine gemeinschaftliche Funktion und gemeinsame Verpflichtungen ein⁽³⁹⁾. Manchmal, wenn auch nicht notwendig, gehören auch physisch-erotische Erscheinungsformen dazu.

(39) CLINES, "David the Man", 225: "The ideology of such male friendship contains these elements: loyalty to one another, a dyadic relationship with an exclusive tendency, a commitment to a common cause, and a valuing of the friendship above all other relationships. In such a friendship there is not necessarily a strong emotional element;

Die altorientalischen und griechisch-römischen Quellen von Gilgameš bis Homer legen ein deutliches Zeugnis von dem Männerbund von dieser Art ab. Daß Ähnliches auch in der Welt der hebräischen Bibel bekannt ist, wird durch die David-Jonatan-Szenen einfach bestätigt⁽⁴⁰⁾. Das Verhältnis von David und Jonatan hat manches gemein mit dem von Gilgameš und Enkidu und dem von Achilleus und Patroklos: gegenseitige emotionale Liebe, Ebenbürtigkeit und das Fehlen der Unterscheidung der aktiven bzw. passiven Rolle, wie auch die eher zurückhaltende Beschreibung der physischen Dimensionen der Beziehung, die allerdings deutlich existieren⁽⁴¹⁾. Außerdem stimmen David, Gilgameš und Achilleus jeweils ein Klagelied für ihre gestorbenen Geliebten an⁽⁴²⁾. Allen diesen Beziehungen ist die pädagogische Funktion und die entsprechende Rollenverteilung der griechischen Päderastie⁽⁴³⁾ fremd, während bei David und Jonatan auch die im Gilgameš-Epos befindliche philosophische Tiefendimension⁽⁴⁴⁾ fehlt.

Wir sind nun soweit, schließlich die Frage zu stellen, ob und wie weit der Begriff Homosexualität mit seinem modernen moralisch-wissenschaftlichen, von den alten Quellen abweichenden Deutungshorizont dazu geeignet ist, den literarisch gestalteten Männerbund von David und Jonatan sachgemäß zu bezeichnen. Daneben erhebt sich aber auch die hermeneutische Frage nach der Zuständigkeit der David-Jonatan-Szenen in der heutigen Diskussion, die ganz und gar von der modernen Begrifflichkeit beeinflusst ist.

Was den Gebrauch des inzwischen problematisch gewordenen Begriffs Homosexualität in diesem Zusammenhang betrifft, so ist es weitgehend Sache der in dem modernen Sexualität-Vokabular Bewanderten zu definieren, ob und inwieweit er im Falle von David und Jonatan am Platze ist. Wird mit diesem Wort eine angeborene oder sonst entwickelte sexuelle Orientation gemeint, so fällt es schwer, den Charakter der Beziehung von

the bond may be more instrumental and functional than affective. Perhaps that is the nature of the bond between David and Jonathan, and that is one of the ways in which they subscribe to, and promote, the Hebrew ideology of masculinity".

⁽⁴⁰⁾ J.C. EXUM, *Tragedy and Biblical Narrative*. Arrows of the Almighty (Cambridge 1992) 73; CLINES, "David the Man", 223-225; vgl. auch NISSINEN, *Homoeotericism*, 53-56. Die kulturgeschichtliche Ableitung von ägyptischen bzw. philistäischen Vorbildern bei SCHROER — STAUBLI, "Saul, David und Jonatan", 20-22 ist interessant, aber recht spekulativ und allzu historisierend. Es ist ihnen immerhin als Verdienst anzurechnen, daß sie zu dem bisher sehr knappen ägyptischen Quellenmaterial zur Gleichgeschlechtlichkeit zwei ikonographische Zeugen hinzugefügt haben.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Zum Vergleich von diesen Verhältnissen, s. HALPERIN, *One Hundred Years*, 75-87.

⁽⁴²⁾ 2 Sam 1,18-27; Gilg. viii 41-5; x 234-238 (S. PARPOLA [Hrsg.] *The Standard Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh* [State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts 1; Helsinki 1997] 99-100; 105-106; vgl. auch MÜLLER, "Trauergesang"; Homer, *Ilias* 24 (H. VAN THIEL [Hrsg.] *Homeri Ilias* [Bibliotheca Weidmanniana 2; Hildesheim 1996] 467ff.).

⁽⁴³⁾ Dazu etwa NISSINEN, *Homoeotericism*, 57-69.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ S. dazu G.F. HELD, "Parallels between *The Gilgamesh Epic* and Plato's *Symposium*", *JNES* 42 (1983) 133-141; S. PARPOLA, "The Assyrian Tree of Life: Tracing the Origins of Jewish Monotheism and Greek Philosophy", *JNES* 52 (1993) 161-208, bes. 192-195; DERS., "The Esoteric Meaning of the Name Gilgamesh", *Intellectual Life of the Ancient Near East* (Hrsg. J. PROSECKY) (CRRAI 43; Prag 1998) 315-329.

David und Jonatan mit ihm zu bezeichnen⁽⁴⁵⁾, denn die Rede von sexueller Orientation in Erzählungen von diesem Alter ist ein deutlicher Anachronismus: ein Text, dem dieser Begriff fehlt, rechnet einfach nicht mit individuellen sexuellen Ausrichtungen⁽⁴⁶⁾. Also kann 'Homosexualität' in bezug auf die David-Jonatan-Szenen nur in einem möglichst breiten und zugleich vagen Sinne als Gleichgeschlechtlichkeit jeder Art verwendet werden, was aber dem weit verbreiteten, auf die persönliche Orientierung hinweisenden modernen Sprachgebrauch nicht entsprechen würde. Ein besseres Wort wäre 'Homoerotik', das als Bezeichnung gleichgeschlechtlichen Umgangs ohne die Annahme einer bestimmten sexuellen Orientation besser funktioniert. Noch sachgemäßer wäre es aber, von einer 'Homosozialität' (engl. 'homosociability') zu reden. Unter diesem Begriff, mehr oder weniger bedeutungsähnlich mit "male bonding", werden gesellschaftliche Beziehungen, Verbindungen und Interdependenzen von Menschen gleichen (meist männlichen) Geschlechts verstanden, wobei der soziale Zusammenschluß und das Nicht-Beteiligtsein des anderen Geschlechts wesentlich ist, während persönliche sexuelle Ausrichtungen der Beteiligten sowie physisch-erotische Dimensionen ihres Verhaltens allenfalls eine geringere Rolle spielen⁽⁴⁷⁾.

Es kann nicht behauptet werden, es hätte in der alten Welt keine gleichgeschlechtlich orientierten und u.U. auch als solche anerkannten Menschen gegeben⁽⁴⁸⁾. Die späte Pathologisierung und Individualisierung der Homosexualität hat aber zur Folge, daß das homoerotische Verhalten in der modernen Welt von einem anderen Blickpunkt aus betrachtet wird als in der Bibel bzw. in zeitgenössischen Quellen, in denen das Verhalten der Menschen von gesellschaftlich kontrollierten und sanktionierten, als gottgegeben verstandenen Konventionen und Tabus gesteuert war, wobei die Regelung des Sexuallebens den Alltag der Gesellschaftsmitglieder am wesentlichsten beeinflusste. Die Ehre und Schande des Mannes und der Frau, d.h. ihre gesellschaftliche Billigung, die nicht zu unterscheiden war von ihrer Position vor der Götterwelt, wurde in bedeutendem Maße von

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Es wird oft darauf hingewiesen, daß David keine Schwierigkeit zu haben scheint, mit Frauen umzugehen; von den Frauen Jonatans hören wir indessen nichts. Es wird später (2 Sam 4,4; 9; 1 Chr 8,34; 9,40) von seinem Sohn namens Meribaal/Mefiboschet erzählt, der aber in der älteren Fassung der Geschichte eigentlich wohl der Sohn Sauls gewesen war; s. T. VEIJOLA, "David und Meribaal", *RB* 85 (1978), 338-361 (= DERS., *David: Gesammelte Studien zu den Davidüberlieferungen des Alten Testaments* [Schriften der Finnischen Exegetischen Gesellschaft 52; Helsinki 1990] 58-83).

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Die Unbrauchbarkeit des Begriffs Homosexualität in diesem Sinne hat u.a. PARKER, "The Hebrew Bible and Homosexuality", 11, richtig gesehen: "That is not to say that such relationships [wie die von David und Jonatan] could not have been homosexual. It is simply to say that the language and literature to which we have access do not disclose homosexual relationships".

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Zur Terminologie s. NISSINEN, *Homoeroticism*, 16-17; zur 'Homosozialität' auch D. MORGAN, *Discovering Men* (Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities 3; London 1992) 67. GERSTENBERGER, "Homosexualität", 151-152, schreibt allerdings ausgerechnet die männliche Homosexualität den Männergemeinschaften von dieser Art zu.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ BROOTEN, *Love between Women*, 242; A. RICHLIN, "Not before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the *Cinaedus* and the Roman Law against Love between Men", *Journal for the History of Sexuality* 3 (1992) 523-573.

dieser Regelung her beurteilt. Die Dichotomie von Homo- bzw. Heterosexualität ist hier nicht entscheidend, sondern die akzeptable Rollenstruktur und entsprechendes Verhalten.

Auch in der modernen Welt geschieht die Interpretation des gleichgeschlechtlichen Aspekts in den David-Jonatan-Szenen keineswegs in einem ideologiefreien Raum, unabhängig von den gesellschaftlichen Bewertungen verschiedener Aspekte der Sexualkultur. Demgemäß scheint die moderne Auslegung dieser Szenen bewußt oder unbewußt von der Frage auszugehen, ob und inwieweit das Verhältnis von David und Jonatan als Beweis einer positiven Einschätzung der Homosexualität in der Bibel gelten kann⁽⁴⁹⁾. Die Frage ist keineswegs unmotiviert, ist es doch die eventuelle Anwendbarkeit der David-Jonatan-Szenen für die Suche von heutigen Homosexuellen nach einer positiven Identifizierungsmöglichkeit in der Bibel und in ihrer Auslegung, die die Diskussion hervorgerufen hat. Diese Tatsache vereitelt das Gespräch nicht, wenn wir davon ausgehen, daß die einschlägigen Bibelstellen nicht nur in kirchlich-theologischen Zusammenhängen, aber auch auf politischen Bühnen interpretiert werden und somit nach wie vor auf die Lebensverhältnisse der in jüdisch-christlichen Kulturen lebenden Menschen einwirken. Dies stellt auch an die wissenschaftliche Arbeit an der Bibel einen Verantwortungsanspruch, es sei denn, daß die Diskussion schwerlich auf ein auf Neutralität strebendes gelehrtes Gespräch zwischen Fachexegeten beschränkt werden kann oder soll.

V

Zusammenfassend läßt sich feststellen, daß in der literarischen Welt der Aufstiegsgeschichte Davids

1) David und Jonatan einander lieben, daß sie also in einer innigen und gegenseitigen Freundschaft verbunden sind, die auch mit manchen erotisch gefärbten Ausdrücken dargestellt ist und in diesem Sinne als homoerotisch bezeichnet werden kann; daß

2) die Erzählung nicht darauf hinweist, daß David und Jonatan beieinander "wie bei einer Frau" liegen, also der eine den anderen sexuell in die Frauenrolle drängt, daß aber im Gegenteil ihre Beziehung als eine zwischen ebenbürtigen Partnern ohne die zu Sexualverhältnissen gehörende Rollenverteilung in die aktive und passive zu interpretieren ist; daß

3) die die Frauenliebe überbietende gegenseitige Liebe der zwei Männer ein mit dem Verhältnis von Gilgameš und Enkidu sowie mit dem von Achilleus und Patroklos vergleichbaren Beispiel einer "male bonding", eines Männerbunds oder der Homosozialität, darstellt; und daß

4) die von moderner Kategorisierung ausgehende Verwendung des Begriffs Homosexualität grundsätzlich irreführt, die aber als fester Bestandteil der Begrifflichkeit der modernen Leser/innen der Bibel zugleich den Ansatzpunkt der exegetischen Diskussion gebildet hat.

Somit haben wir uns nicht mit einem historisch-literarischen, sondern mit einem hermeneutischen Problem befaßt, bei deren Behandlung nicht

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Dies ist sowohl von SCHROER – STAUBLI, "Saul, David und Jonatan", 15 als auch von ZEHNDER, "Beobachtungen", 178-179 wahrgenommen worden.

nur der Bibeltext und seine Auslegung, sondern auch und vor allem die Interpretation des Geschlechts in der modernen westlichen Gesellschaft mitspielt (50). Auf die Frage, ob die Beziehung von David und Jonatan als Ausdruck der Homosexualität zu verstehen ist, ist im Text keine eindeutige Antwort zu finden, denn die Frage ist der Textwelt fremd. Als eine Frage, die sich aus dem Leben der modernen Leserschaft erhebt und dieses widerspiegelt, ist sie allerdings durchaus legitim und kann und muß deswegen auch von den heutigen Leser/innen der Bibel erwogen werden.

Raidepolku 2
FIN-00750 Helsinki

Martti NISSINEN

SUMMARY

In the recent debate concerning the relationship of David and Jonathan as described in 1 Sam 18–20 and 2 Sam 1 the main issue has been whether or not the love between these male persons should be characterized as “homosexual”. Since the concept of homosexuality is not inherent in the biblical text but rather reflects the modern interpretation of gender, its use has been justly questioned. It is argued in this article that neither the story of David and Jonathan nor such texts as Gen 19,1–11, Judg 19 and Lev 18,22 and 20,13 can be interpreted as reflecting an overall concept of homosexuality. The relationship of David and Jonathan may be understood as a socially acceptable male bonding between equals, in which mutual love and affection is depicted with some homoerotic traits but in which the differentiation of active and passive, i.e. male and female sexual roles plays no role. The biblical text does not disclose homosexual orientation, thus it is up to the modern reader to decide to what extent the relationship of David and Jonathan corresponds to what is today called ‘homosexuality’.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Weitere hermeneutische Überlegungen z.B. bei PARKER, “The Hebrew Bible and Homosexuality”; GERSTENBERGER, “Homosexualität”; NISSINEN, *Homoeroticism*, 123–134.

The Phrase וּבַעֲצִים וּבָאֲבָנִים in Exod 7,19

In the so-called 'Plague Narrative' (Exod 7–11) and already in the very first plague (Exod 7,14-25) which relates the story of water turning into blood, the reader is confronted with a strange expression. Its meaning is dubious and difficult to understand. Offering the enumeration of all the places in which the water changes its colour, Exod 7,19 concludes with the formula וּבַעֲצִים וּבָאֲבָנִים. These words can be literally translated as, 'in the wood and in the stones', which in the Septuagint text has ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ καὶ ἐν τοῖς λίθοις as its translation equivalent.

Ever since historical-critical exegesis has tried to explain this expression, several solutions have come to the fore⁽¹⁾. The classical solution that scholars have often proposed is to translate it by, 'vessels of wood and vessels of stone', in other words, as a reference to the recipients in which water was kept⁽²⁾. The discussion on the material as well as the nature and the use of these vessels is sometimes very historicizing⁽³⁾. An alternative explanation translates the expression וּבַעֲצִים וּבָאֲבָנִים as, 'in the trees and in the stones', or understands it in a more derived way as, 'the

(¹) An excellent survey of these hypotheses has been offered by C. HOUTMAN, "On the Meaning of *ûbâ 'ešîm ûbâ 'ăbānîm* in Exodus 7,19", *VT* 36 (1986) 347-351.

(²) Cf., e.g. C.F. KEIL – F. DELITZSCH, *Die Bücher Moses*. DI. 1 (BC 1; Leipzig 1866) 369: "sowohl in den Hölzern als in den Steinen", d.h. in den hölzernen und steinernen Wassergefäßen, in welchen man das aus dem Nile und seinen Gewässern geschöpfte Wasser für den Gebrauch aufbewahrte"; H.L. STRACK – O. BÖCKLER, *Die Bücher Genesis, Exodus, Levitikus und Numeri* (KK A,1; München 1894) 185: "in hölzernen und steinernen Gefäßen"; A. DILLMANN – V. RYSEL, *Die Bücher Exodus und Levitikus* (KEH 12; Leipzig 1897) 82: "und in den Hölzern und in den Steinen, d.h. holzernen und steinernen Wasser-Behälten oder Gefäßen die man in den Häusern hat." See also B. BAENTSCH, *Exodus, Levitikus; übersetzt und erklärt* (HK; Göttingen 1900) 61; H. HOLZINGER, *Exodus* (KHC 2; Tübingen 1900) 23; A.H. MCNEILE, *The Book of Exodus with Introduction and Notes* (WC; London 1908) 47-48; S.R. DRIVER, *The Book of Exodus* (CBSC; Cambridge 1911) 61; H. GUNKEL – W. STAERK – P. VOLZ (eds.), *Die Schriften des Alten Testaments in Auswahl neu übersetzt und für die Gegenwart erklärt*. Band 1,1: *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen* (Göttingen 1921) 42; W.H. GISPEN, *Het boek Exodus* (KVHS; Kampen 1932) 80, 84; P. HEINISCH, *Das Buch Exodus* (HSAT 1,2; Bonn 1934) 81-82; E. KALT, *Genesis, Exodus und Levitikus* (HBK 1; Freiburg 1948) 274, 281; J.C. RYLAARSDAM, *The Book of Exodus. Introduction and Exegesis* (IntB 1; New York – Nashville 1952) 896; B. COUROYER, *L'Exode* (SB(J); Paris 1952) 49; R.E. CLEMENTS, *Exodus* (CNEB; London 1972) 45-46; R.A. COLE, *Exodus, an Introduction and Commentary* (TOTC; London 1973) 90; B.S. CHILDS, *Exodus, a Commentary* (OTL; London 1974) 122, 154; F. MICHAËLI, *Le livre de l'Exode* (CAT 2; Neuchâtel – Paris 1974) 71; R.J. BURNS, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers* (OTMes 3; Wilmington, DE 1983) 73; J.I. DURHAM, *Exodus* (WBC 3; Waco 1987) 93; J. SCHARBERT, *Exodus* (NEB.AT 24; Würzburg 1989) 37.

(³) See, e.g. KEIL – DELITZSCH, *Die Bücher Moses*, 369-370; DILLMANN – RYSEL, *Exodus*, 82; HOLZINGER *Exodus*, 23; MCNEILE, *The Book of Exodus*, 47-48; GISPEN, *Het boek Exodus*, 84; P. HEINISCH, *Das Buch Exodus*, 81-82. Cf., however, G. BEER, *Exodus*. Mit einem Beitrag von K. GALLING (HAT 1,3; Tübingen 1939) 48 and J.P. HYATT, *Commentary on Exodus* (NCBC; London 1971) 106.

sap in the trees and the water in the wells' (*). Here, 'wells' is interpreted as springs in rocky and stony places. Subsequently, this particular proposal concerning the meaning of ובעצים ובאבנים has been related to, affirmed or slightly modified by the significance of similar expressions in Ugaritic texts (*).

Following the lead of C. Houtman, I hold the opinion that there is no need to refer to Ugaritic texts in finding a satisfactory explanation for the interpretation of the expression ובעצים ובאבנים in Exod 7,19 (*). Within the biblical writings themselves one can find many instances where this formula is used, sometimes applied identically, sometimes somewhat altered.

In many cases, the cited expression refers to building materials, especially with regard to the temple, as can be seen in 1 Kgs 5,32; 2 Kgs 12,13; 2 Kgs 22,6 and 1 Chr 22,14. In other texts, namely Lev 14,45; 1 Kgs 15,22; Ezek 26,12; Hab 2,11; Zech 5,4; 1 Chr 22,15; 2 Chr 2,13; 16,6 and 34,11, the two words עץ and אבן are used with more distance between them and/or placed in a reversed order, but most of the time equally in the context of a description of the temple's building materials.

In Houtman's view, this fact enables the reader to interpret the formula ובעצים ובאבנים in Exod 7,19 as "a *pars pro toto* for buildings erected of timber and stones". As a consequence, Exod 7,19 is demonstrating that "the power emanating from Aaron's outstretched staff will be so strong that it will penetrate even into solid and impenetrable buildings; water kept in stock there, will not be unaffected, but will turn into blood" (*).

Although Houtman's interpretation offers a plausible explanation, it should be noticed that the combination of עץ and אבן in the Hebrew Bible is also used in another sense, namely as an explicit reference to the foreign gods or idols made of wood and stone (*). This is clearly the case in Deut

(*) See B.D. EERDMANS, *Alttestamentliche Studien III. Das Buch Exodus* (Giessen 1910) 23: "Alles Wasser wird zu Blut werden, sogar das Wasser in den Bäumen und den Steinen, d.h. der Saft der Bäume und die Quellen". Cf., also e.g. BEER, *Exodus*, 48; M. NOTH, *Das zweite Buch Mose. Exodus, übersetzt und erklärt* (ATD 5; Göttingen 1959) 46; G. TE STROETE, *Exodus: uit de grondtekst vertaald en uitgelegd* (BOT 1,2; Roermond - Maaseik 1966) 72; HYATT, *Exodus*, 106; E. ZENGER, *Das Buch Exodus* (GSL.AT 7; Düsseldorf 1978) 90-91. CLEMENTS, *Exodus*, 46, mentions both explanations as equally plausible alternatives, while COLE, *Exodus*, 90, offering the two hypotheses, clearly favours the first.

(*) See J. COPPENS, "Miscellanées Bibliques", *ETHL* 23 (1947) 173-190, especially 177-178 but also M.H. POPE, "Mid Rock and Scrub. A Ugaritic Parallel to Exodus 7,19", *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies. Essays in Honor of W.S. LaSor* (Grand Rapids 1978) 146-150 and Z. ZEVIT, "The Priestly Redaction and Interpretation of the Plague Narrative in Exodus", *JQR* 66 (1975-1976) 193-211, in particular 199-200, who refers to S.E. LOEWENSTAMM, *The Tradition of the Exodus in its Development* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem 1965) 36, n. 34.

(*) Cfr. HOUTMAN, "On the Meaning", 350.

(*) HOUTMAN, "On the Meaning", 350. Cf., also ID., *Exodus; vertaald en verklaard. Dl. 2: Exodus, 7:14-19:25* (COT; Kampen 1989) 43-45; id., *Exodus*, Vol. 2: *Ex 7:14-19:25* (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Kampen 1996) 35-37 and id., *Exodus I. Een praktische bijbelverklaring* (Tekst en Toelichting; Kampen 1988) 68.

(*) The interpretation of the combination of עץ and אבן as a reference to idols or foreign gods is confirmed by the usage of a verb denoting cultic attitudes in the immediate literary context.

4,28; 28,36.64; 29,16; 2 Kgs 19,18; Isa 37,19 and Ezek 20,32. In Jer 2,27 and 3,9, both words are used in the same context, but in the first pericope the two items (עץ and אבן) are slightly more remote from each other, while in the latter they are read in a reversed order.

On the basis of this observation, the interpretation of the expression ובעצים ובאבנים in Exod 7,19, as referring to 'foreign gods' or 'idols', has already been defended in rabbinic literature⁽⁹⁾. Later on, this hypothesis has been followed by U. Cassuto⁽¹⁰⁾, but seems to have been forgotten in recent times. In my opinion, however, this proposal is worth reflection, especially for two reasons.

Firstly, when one studies the usage of the terms עץ and אבן in the two meanings — referring to building materials and to idols — it is remarkable that the expression is used much more strictly in the latter than in the former sense. When the two words evoke the idols, they are generally put in the same order and very close to each other. When עץ and אבן denote building materials, the words are often somewhat distanced from each other, as parts of an enumeration of other kinds of materials, and sometimes also placed in a reversed order. The expression ובעצים ובאבנים in Exod 7,19 is clearly formulated in the strict way, the two words next to each other and in the fixed order, i.e. first עץ and consequently אבן, precisely as it is done in the instances referring to idols.

Secondly, when the formula ובעצים ובאבנים in Exod 7,19 is understood as referring to the idols, then the verse definitely ends in a climax. Everything in Egypt is polluted by the blood; even Egypt's gods are subdued by YHWH's power. This meaning then would fit very well into the general tone and message of the "Plague Narrative", namely, the demonstration of YHWH's incomparable power as well as the recognition and acknowledgement of his might by both Israel and Egypt. In this respect, some scholars even hold the opinion that the narrative implies a mockery of the Egyptian pantheon⁽¹¹⁾. Moreover, the climax described above is even strengthened grammatically in the text itself. The formula ובעצים ובאבנים in Exod 7,19 is presented with a double ו-construction, of which the second one can obviously be considered as a common phrasal ו as a conjunction, but the first one can clearly function as a beautiful example of the so-called

⁽⁹⁾ See, e.g., Exodus Rabbah IX,11 and Zohar Exodus 29a.

⁽¹⁰⁾ U. CASSUTO, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus* (Jerusalem 1967) 99.

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf., very explicitly e.g., Z. ZEVIT, "Three Ways to Look at the Ten Plagues", *BiRe* 6 (3/1990) 16-23, 42, 44; N.M. SARNA, *Exodus שמות*. The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation (JPSTC; Philadelphia – New York – Jerusalem 1991) 38-40, 44, 50; J. REINDL, "Der Finger Gottes und die Macht der Götter. Ein Problem des Ägyptischen Diasporajudentums und sein literarischer Niederschlag", *EThtSt* 37 (1977) 49-60 and less extensively, e.g., F. MICHAËLI, *Le livre de l'Exode*, 85, 93-94; G.A.F. KNIGHT, *Theology as Narration*. A Commentary on the Book of Exodus (Grand Rapids 1976) 59, 62-63, 65, 67; ZENGER, *Das Buch Exodus*, 93, 114; HYATT, *Commentary on Exodus*, 99; N.M. SARNA, *Exploring Exodus: the Heritage of Biblical Israel* (New York 1986) 78-80; J. MORGENSTERN, "The Despoiling of the Egyptians", *JBL* 68 (1949) 1-28, esp. 25-27; L. SCHMIDT, *Beobachtungen in der Plagenerzählung in Exodus VII,14-XI,10* (StB 4; Leiden – New York – Copenhagen – Cologne 1990) 60; D.J. MCCARTHY, "Moses' Dealings with Pharaoh: Ex 7,8-10,27", *CBQ* 27 (1965) 336-347, esp. 344.

waw emphaticum⁽¹²⁾. The translation of the end of Exod 7,19 would then sound like “there was blood in all the land of Egypt, *even* (first ו) on their [idols of] stone and (second ו) wood”, and thus would point, as proposed above, to the victory of YHWH’s power over the Egyptian idols.

There are two objections, however, that could be raised against this proposal. A first critical remark pertains to the fact that the literary context of Exod 7,19 is not explicitly one in which idolatry comes to the fore, while all the other instances using the studied combination of עץ and אֶבֶן offer supplementary indications as to the direction of interpretation such as specific verbs or more elaborate clarifications of the context. This is true, but the biblical references of the studied expression denoting building materials also offer some supplementary contextual indications. Exod 7,19, however, does not suggest any particular explanation at all, either as building materials or as idols. Thus, its understanding in terms of foreign gods or idols must not be excluded due to lack of contextual indications.

The second objection is more substantiated. It must be noticed that all the texts, which use the studied formula in the literary context of the idols, express both terms, עץ and אֶבֶן, grammatically always in the singular. When applied in the sense of building materials, however, the expression is grammatically conceived in the plural. Thus, it should be admitted that Exod 7,19 would take a special place within the series of biblical pericopes referring to idols, since its formula וּבַעֲצִים וּבִאֲבָנִים is clearly in the plural.

Nevertheless, I remain of the opinion that this fact does not alter the proposed meaning of the final words of Exod 7,19. First of all, if one studies the instances referring to idols more closely, it is obvious that the used singular form is in fact a collective singular, often even combined with plural verb forms and plural pronominal suffixes referring to it (cf. e.g. 2 Kgs 19,18; Isa 37,19). Why would it not be equally possible then, to use a real plural as in Exod 7,19, instead of a collective singular, when the meaning remains identical? Moreover, if one studies the Septuagint’s translation equivalents for the Hebrew collective singular referring to idols, one notices that in six in a total of nine cases (Deut 4,28; 28,36.64; 2 Kgs 19,18; Isa 37,19 and Ezek 20,32), LXX offers a grammatically plural expression, namely ξύλα καὶ λίθοι⁽¹³⁾. Would this plural Greek expression refer, therefore, to building materials just because it is a plural?

If it is possible to read the “Plague Narrative” — of course not exclusively — as a mockery of the Egyptian pantheon, and if the expression וּבַעֲצִים וּבִאֲבָנִים in Exod 7,19 can indeed be understood as a reference to the Egyptian idols, then it can be concluded that the end of this verse, within the context of the first plague, is no longer an unimportant *curiosum*.

⁽¹²⁾ Cf. especially B. WALTKE – M. O’CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake 1990) 648-649, §39.2.1b on *waw emphaticum* as a special case of *waw explicativum*. See on *waw explicativum* also R. MEYER, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Berlin – New York 1992) III, 91 [433, §112.3a and J.P. LETTINGA, *Grammatica van het Bijbels Hebreeuws* (Leiden 1976) 150, §63a. The double use of *waw* is also discussed in P. JOÜON – T. MURAOKA, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (SubBib 14/II; Rome 1991) 653, §177o-p.

⁽¹³⁾ In Deut 29,16; Jer 2,27 and 3,9, LXX offers a singular expression, literally corresponding to the Hebrew singular.

Rather, it would become a programmatic word play for the whole "Plague Narrative". Already in the first plague, YHWH wins the battle in every aspect!

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Faculty of Theology
St.-Michielsstraat 6,
B - 3000 Leuven

Bénédicté LEMMELIJN

SUMMARY

Offering the enumeration of all the places in which the water turns into blood, Exod 7,19 concludes with the formula ובעצים ובאבנים. Its meaning is dubious and difficult to understand. However, a meticulous comparison of the usage of this formula in Exod 7,19 with its functioning in other parts of the Old Testament demonstrates that ובעצים ובאבנים in Exod 7,19 refers to the Egyptian gods or idols.

Chronistic Tendency in 1 Chr 18,10-11

1 Chr 18 runs parallel to 2 Sam 8. Between the two chapters there are a few differences which are stylistic in nature or are related to the transmission of the text. In only a few cases is it a disputed question whether or not the difference betrays a Chronistic point of view. These include the omission in v. 2 of David's harsh treatment of the Moabites, the addition in v. 8b of the remark that the bronze which David took from the Aramean cities was used by Solomon for the temple, and the change with respect to the position of David's sons in v. 17.

It is the contention of this article that a case of Chronistic tendency occurs in vv. 10-11. According to 2 Sam 8,10 King Toi of Hamath sent his son to David on a diplomatic mission with "(ובידו היו)" articles of silver, gold and bronze". The words ובידו היו are omitted in Chronicles, which, moreover has וכל כלי instead of the first כלי in the Samuel text. The result is that Chronicles now has "and all the articles of gold, silver and bronze", which is only very loosely connected with what precedes, if connected at all. Rudolph⁽¹⁾ tries to solve this difficulty by considering the *waw* in וכל a *waw concomitantes*, or, alternatively, by reading *b'kol* (cp. *BHS*). In the latter suggestion he is followed by Japhet. Apart from the fact that there is no text-critical justification for the emendation, neither proposal really softens the syntactical problem. In general, exegetes and translators deal with this omission as accidental and translate the verse as if the omitted words have to be understood anyway.

Some examples are the following:

Myers: "[He also sent] all sorts of...objects";

Galling: "und in seiner Hand waren goldene...Geräte";

NRSV: "He sent all sorts of articles of gold...";

TOB: "[pour le féliciter] et pour lui apporter toutes sortes d'objets d'or...";

Tanakh; NJPST: "[he brought with him] all manner of gold... objects".

This type of translation is basically based on the text of Samuel. This translation would be justified if there were any reason to consider the omission as accidental but no such reason has been adduced. Instead, there are strong reasons to assume the change to be deliberate.

If we leave the Samuel text aside for a while, then the obvious translation is that in which "all the articles of gold, silver, and bronze" is no

⁽¹⁾ Names of authors without title refer to the following commentaries: K. GALLING, *Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemiah* (ATD; Göttingen 1954); W. RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher* (HAT; Tübingen 1955); J.M. MYERS, *I Chronicles* (AB; Garden City 1973); H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCBC; Grand Rapids 1982); R. BRAUN, *1 Chronicles* (WBC; Waco 1986); S. JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles* (OTL; London 1993).

longer connected with what precedes, but is the proleptic object of "dedicate" in v. 11, taken up by אֵלֶּם: "As for all the articles of gold, silver and bronze, David dedicated them also". As far as I am aware, only Braun maintains this division. This rendering, based on a smooth syntax, is the most natural translation of the text of Chronicles. That we have here indeed a deliberate restructuring of the text is confirmed by the addition of וְכָל, "and all". In the first place, the *waw* marks a new clause. Secondly, "all" is meaningless if the text is understood on the basis of Samuel: Hadoram came with (a number of) articles, not with "all articles" (?), but in Chronicles it makes good sense: all articles which had been taken as spoil were dedicated (see below).

The decisive question, of course, is what the Chronicler may have intended by this change. The answer lies, I propose, in the fact that וְכִידוֹ הָיוּ refers to a gift, and the Chronicler was not willing to have gifts from foreign kings used for the temple. He did not object to spoils of war being used that way, since in that case David or Solomon (vv. 8.11) assigned for the temple what in fact belonged already to God. In this connection it is interesting to note a small but telling difference between this verse and its parallel. 2 Sam 8,11 has: "These also King David dedicated to YHWH together with the silver...that he had *dedicated* from all the peoples...". Chronicles has "the silver...that he had *taken* (נָשָׂא) from all the peoples...". Although the Samuel text can only refer to spoil, the Chronicler wants to make this explicit by using the unambiguous "taken [as spoil]".

This dogmatic change was possible with only a small textual change. By leaving out וְכִידוֹ הָיוּ the articles were no longer gifts from Toi (or Tou), brought to David by Hadoram. The diplomatic mission now marks the victorious end of David's campaign against Hadadezer. In the new sentence, which begins with וְכָל, the Chronicler implies that the articles had been taken as spoil from Hadadezer and the emphatic גַּם־אֵלֶּם "these also", connects with v. 8. The Chronicler wants us to understand that these articles were taken as spoil in addition to that mentioned in vv. 7-8. It is true that in v. 8 it is Solomon who actually used the bronze for the temple, but no doubt the Chronicler implies that Solomon only used what David had assigned for this purpose; compare ch. 22; 28; 2 Chr 5,1.

The above is confirmed by two other changes in v. 11, which commentators do not link up with the omission in v. 10. The Samuel parallel of 1 Chr 18,11, 2 Sam 8,11, reads "These also King David dedicated to YHWH together with the silver and the gold that he had dedicated from all the peoples which he had subdued, from Aram, Moab, the Ammonites, the Philistines, Amalek, and from the spoil of King Hadadezer, son of Rehob of Zobah". Instead of "from Aram" Chronicles has "from Edom". Commentators consider this a case of interchange between *waw* and *daleth*, as often occurs. Michaeli and Rudolph think that "Aram" is the older text on the basis of the Samuel parallel; Williamson and Japhet do not commit themselves with respect to this question. However, the

(?) Commentaries and translations render כָּל therefore with "all sorts of" (see before), or leave it untranslated (e.g. *REB*). This rendering is more an indication of the problem than a solution of it.

change seems to be deliberate: if the last part of v. 11 refers to Hadadezer of Aram, then the mention of Aram in the list of other nations from which spoil was taken would be strange. This problem was very elegantly solved by the Chronicler with the minimal change from "Aram" to "Edom".

The same difficulty was faced by the Chronicler at the end of the Samuel text, where the spoil of Hadadezer is explicitly mentioned. There was no problem in adding this spoil to the articles brought as tribute by Hadoram. Things are different in Chronicles: the mention of the spoil of Hadadezer was impossible now that v. 10, as restructured by the Chronicler, was meant to refer to the spoil of Hadadezer. Therefore, these words are omitted altogether.

In conclusion: after the Chronicler had omitted **וּבִידוֹ הָיוּ** he made three other changes to adapt the text to the new implied meaning, one in v. 10 and three in v. 11. To deal with these changes in isolation is overlooking their inner cohesion and missing an interesting piece of Chronistic thinking.

Heivlinder 73
2317 JV Leiden
The Netherlands

Piet B. DIRKSEN

SUMMARY

The omission of **וּבִידוֹ הָיוּ** and the addition of **וְכָל** in 1 Chr 18,10 are deliberate. The last part of v. 10 now connects with v. 11 and refers to the spoil of Hadadezer instead of to the gift of King Toi. This interpretation is confirmed by three other Chronistic changes in v. 11.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Olivier ARTUS, *Études sur le livre des Nombres*. Récit, histoire et loi en Nb 13,1–20,13 (OBO 157). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag-Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997. ix-298p. 16,5 x 23,5. SFr 69 – DM 84 – ÖS 615, —

Dr. Artus has given us an exceedingly detailed and well-researched study of Num 13,1–20,13, as a pericope integrated into the structure of the book of Numbers, with its unique juxtaposition of narrative and legislative texts. The resulting book will surely be recognized as a basic authority on this difficult and often neglected book of the Bible. The study was carried out as preparation of a doctoral thesis, which was presented at the Institut Catholique in Paris in 1995. It was awarded the “prix Pange” in 1996.

Amid the current disarray in pentateuchal source-criticism, much daring is needed to undertake a historical-critical analysis within it. The author begins by indicating the parameters of his question, and reviewing recent pentateuchal scholarship. In the ensuing chapters, he does not flinch from the task of minute examination of each word, phrase, and verse, in dialogue with the innumerable source critics and other biblical scholars who precede him, nor from the challenge of establishing an hypothesis of continuing sources within this pericope. He establishes a persuasive account of the sources and levels of editing, which he relates to, without depending on either the classical source critics or their contemporary gainsayers. Throughout he maintains a clarity of style, and a reader-friendly structuring of information, such that one can read his work with some ease and pleasure.

The book begins with a synchronic study of the book, and then of the pericope. Then it proceeds to diachronic analyses. It concludes with a recapitulation of findings and synthesis, followed by indices and bibliography.

The synchronic structure of the book (astutely defined by the author as an “hypothèse de lecture qui cherche à faciliter la compréhension d'un texte”, 35) consists of a tripartite division: (a) Preparation of the first generation at Sinai – Num 1–10; (b) Desert wandering and infidelities – Num 11–22,1; (c) Preparation of second generation in Moab – Num 22,2–36,13. This represents a substantial advance over the pathfinding synchronic study of T.D. Olson, *The Death of the Old and the Birth of the New* (Chico, CA 1985), whose exclusive focus on the change of generations failed to account for the geographic data or for the mixture of laws and narrative.

Within the second section of the book, 13,1 begins to present a collection of juxtaposed narratives and legislative materials linked externally by a geographic location, i.e. Kadesh, which extend to 20,13. One must ask if the juxtaposition is intentional, i.e. is this really a literary unit whose meaning is to be found in the whole rather than the parts? The first question then is: in synchronic reading what evidence of editorial linking do we find in this text? There will follow in later chapters a second question: in diachronic reading what meaning is revealed by the order in which these materials were attached one to the other? Specifically, at what point in the evolution of the narrative, and for what theological motive, were Num 15 and 18 inserted?

The author then makes a case for isolating 13,1–20,13 tentatively and he examines internal evidence for its literary unity. He shows that the three narrative sections have structures which are parallel, that they are linked by a progressive theme (rebellion of the people, rebellion of the leaders, and rebellion of Moses and Aaron), and that they are characterized by the use of same words. Moreover, he shows links between the legal sections and the narrative sections: words, phrases, and themes. All of these observations lead to the conclusion that the many small and diverse units have been consciously linked in a unified literary statement: a presentation of Yahweh leading Sinai's Israel, which massively rebels, and which is entirely replaced (except for Caleb and Joshua) by a new community at Moab.

The synchronic study ends in ch. 4, with a narrative analysis using semiotic method. This study provides evidence to identify the principal narrative programme as God's project to establish a people for himself in a promised land, having freed them from Egypt, and to show all other narrative elements to be either (1) "adjuvant" to this programme, or (2) contrary to it, or as (3) cancelling one of the contrary programmes. In this way, the whole Kadesh pericope is shown to be, not as a collection, but as a powerfully unified narrative. Moreover he notes that every literary unit in the pericope contains a theme of rebellion pointing to an "isotopie sémiologique" of fidelity; and that many themes of power-struggle point to another "isotopie" of authority.

It is interesting to note that Num 20,1-13 fits badly into this narrative analysis: the apparent rebellion of the people is not interpreted in the text as a rebellion, but rather as a demand for water which God in effect legitimates. The story is adjuvant rather than contrary (as the author would have it, 76), though Moses and Aaron are contrary and get cancelled. One is tempted to ask if this break in pattern is not a major, and overlooked, clue to meaning in this confusing text.

There follow three chapters which provide extraordinarily refined, and meticulously researched, literary analyses of Num 13–14; 16–17; 21,1-3, which separate the interwoven narrative threads, based on the hypothesis of an actual historical sequence (diachrony) such that the narrative threads proceed from different historical contexts. Whether or not the historical separations and contexts can be proven, the analysis yields a penetrating and precise understanding of the values carried by these narratives.

Ch. 5 presents a source-criticism of Num 13–14. The author proposes

a pre-priestly account, a priestly account, and a series of post-deuteronomic additions. The pre-priestly was a legend concerning Caleb and Hebron. The priestly was a theological story of sin and immediate radical punishment. It affirms in narrative form the teaching which ch. 15 will affirm in legal form. The post-deuteronomic account highlights Joshua, thus providing for a continuity with the Deuteronomist's story of divine intervention, and it develops a story of sin followed by pardon rather than punishment. The priestly and deuteronomistic teachings are juxtaposed, not harmonised.

Ch. 6 deals diachronically with the three narratives in Numbers 16–17, and their relations to the law collections of Num 15 and 18–19. First 16,1–17,5 is broken down into an original story of Dathan and Abiram rebelling against the authority of Moses, and a subsequent priestly story and priestly editing which, reacting to the dt doctrine of the holiness of Israel based on covenantal relationship (Dt 7,6 and 14,2; and cf. Num 16,3), and developing beyond the early priestly idea of holiness based on belonging to the sacral sphere (Num 15,40), sharply marks different degrees of holiness (= sacredness) separating lay-people, levites, and priests, and the pre-eminence of Aaron. Then a delicate analysis of 17,6–15 and 17,16–28 shows priestly narrative and editing at work unifying all three narratives, developing the same teaching, and preparing in narrative form for the teaching in legal texts of Num 18–19.

Ch. 7 attempts to solve the perennial problem in Num 20,1–13 of how one should define the sin, which will keep Moses and Aaron from entering the Promised Land. If the solution is to be drawn from the text, rather than from intuitive creativity, it must come from literary analysis, and from a close study of the relation between this text and its earlier model in Ex 17,1–7. The author finds a unified narrative in vv. 2.4–7.8*.10. 11b.12, in which the priestly author has written a pendant to Ex 17,1–7. The latter is a story of the sin of the people, and the former is a priestly creation telling of a parallel sin of Moses and Aaron. The remaining verses in Num 20,1–13 are editorial retouching calculated to enhance the stature of Moses, and to obscure the nature of the sin of Moses and Aaron. This too could be assigned to a “post-deuteronomic” priestly editor, wanting to harmonise Numbers with the image of Moses in Deuteronomy. By separating the post-deuteronomic editing out of the original priestly tale, the author can argue that the priestly writer originally depicted the sin of Moses and Aaron unambiguously: it was simply lack of trust in Yahweh, parallel to the lack of trust of the people in Ex 17,1–7.

Ch. 8 puts the source divisions together, distinguishing the series of priestly narratives from the several series of later priestly, lay, and post-deuteronomic “relectures” and minor editorial adjustments. This division permits the conclusion that the priestly narratives took up in an independent, and partially contradictory, manner the earlier narrative, while the subsequent touching up has the character of obscuring differences, linking texts together, and occasionally correcting the combined text. Num 16–17 is inserted into the combined source and represents a later development in priestly teaching. A special characteristic of this whole Kadesh pericope is the integration of narrative and legal pericopes which were sedulously linked both verbally and thematically.

Ch. 9 lays out diachronically the various teachings regarding holiness, sin-and-pardon, and history. (a) Holiness: in Dt this means being conformed to a divinely imposed social ethic; in P, it means belonging to the chosen people; in later priestly teaching there are established specific degrees of holiness/sacredness from lay to levite to priestly, and then the supremacy of Aaronide priesthood. (b) Sin-and-pardon: in priestly teaching, with its individualistic ethic and black and white understanding, sin was incompatible with the sacred, thus pardon could be conceived only for sins of inadvertence, while intentional sinners were annihilated; post-deuteronomic belief included intercession and pardon. (c) History: the author presents the variety of historical contexts, and the value of, and criteria for, interpreting past stories in the light of contemporary historical experience.

The book ends with a chapter of conclusions, pointing out the depth of priestly influence in the book of Numbers which this study brings clearly into focus. The priestly authors have made of Numbers a structured and unified book, (not merely part of a Tetrateuch or Pentateuch), and they have marked its meaning, not only by writing an independent history, but also by careful editing of the combined text, and in particular by the insertion of legislative materials in such a way as to turn the narratives into theologically motivated stories which illustrate the values expressed in the laws. Moreover this involvement of the priestly community in the writing of the Torah shows that their view of salvation was not restricted to the cult, but extended to the book and to the national community it nourished. The Pentateuch did not include an account of the conquest, but the late quiet insertion of references to Joshua, whose triumphant role was familiar to Jews at least, went as far they dared in publishing the history of Israel while under the powerful control of the Persian emperor.

Concordia University
7141 Sherbrooke St. W.
Montreal, Qc H4B-1R6, Canada

Sean McEVENUE

Robert O'CONNELL, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges* (VTS 63).
Leiden – New York – Köln, E.J. Brill, 1996. xxii-541p. 16,5 x
24,5. Dfl 245 – \$158.50

Professeur à Denver (Colorado Christian University), R. O'Connell nous offre en cet ouvrage le résultat de recherches doctorales (Cambridge, 1993), faites sous la direction de J.A. Emerton et R.P. Gordon. Contribution importante à l'interprétation du livre des Juges, cette étude technique pourra servir à plus d'un titre comme instrument de travail. Elle prend en considération l'ensemble du livre des Juges pour en révéler les lignes de force et l'unité sur le plan littéraire, tout particulièrement par l'examen de l'action ou de l'intrigue («plot-structure»).

À première vue, on ne s'attend pas à ce que l'exégète se préoccupe

de la perspective historique. Mais on découvre assez tôt que ce n'est pas vraiment le cas, puisque O'Connell tient compte des recherches historico-critiques, et il nous fournit des instruments pour continuer la recherche dans cette ligne.

Par «rhétorique», l'A. entend le point de vue du «compilateur ou rédacteur» du livre des Juges, point de vue qui permet d'étudier le livre des Juges comme un tout. Je cite: «Throughout the work, the term 'rhetoric' is understood to refer to the ideological purpose or agenda of the Judges compiler/redactor with respect to the implied readers of the book» («Introduction», 1). La référence au «compiler/redactor» sera constante, sans plus de précision: c'est une façon de désigner le responsable de la forme finale du texte. Par le fait même, les aspérités du texte, tout comme les allusions considérées par d'autres méthodes comme témoins d'interventions postérieures, servent plutôt à montrer la cohérence du texte actuel. Réaction utile, qui ne peut toutefois clore le débat, comme en font foi les remarques de l'A. lui-même.

O'Connell insiste sur le cadre fourni par le double prologue (1,1-2,5 et 2,6-3,6) et le double dénouement (17-18 et 19-21), textes où l'influence deutéronomiste est marquée et qui contiennent les éléments idéologiques du livre dans sa rédaction finale. Il est à noter que, en raison de son approche littéraire, l'A. n'entend pas se prononcer sur ce qui ferait l'objet de deux étapes de rédaction (deutéronomique et deutéronomiste). Il fait donc usage de l'adjectif «deuteronomic» sans distinctions ultérieures.

La thèse de l'ouvrage, énoncée clairement ici et là, est reprise en conclusion: «the rhetorical purpose of the book of Judges is ostensibly to enjoin its readers to endorse a divinely appointed Judahite king who, in contrast to foreign kings or non-Judahite deliverers in Israel, upholds such deuteronomic ideals as the need to expel foreigners from the land and the need to maintain intertribal loyalty to YHWH's cult and his regulations concerning social justice» (343). L'attention à la tribu de Juda, le souci d'expulser les étrangers, le besoin de souligner la cohésion et la fidélité de toutes les tribus (entre elles et sous leur roi), de même que l'engagement à suivre les normes culturelles et celles de la justice sociale, voilà la clé de lecture de l'ensemble du livre des Juges.

Il apparaît assez clairement que, sous un autre angle, cette lecture adopte le point de vue d'un lecteur «deutéronomiste». De fait, la thèse est cohérente, bien présentée, mais je crois aussi qu'elle dépasse quelque peu les limites d'une analyse de type rhétorique. D'autre part, O'Connell permet de constater qu'en exégèse les méthodes d'analyse et de synthèse sont complémentaires.

Après une introduction — brève et claire à souhait — sur le plan de l'ouvrage, l'A. divise son travail en quatre chapitres, dont le deuxième comprend plus de deux cents pages.

Le ch. 1 («Rhetorical Concerns of Judges' Tribal-Political and Deuteronomic Schemata», 10-57) se sert du double prologue et du double dénouement pour montrer comment Juda est au centre des préoccupations des tribus, au point que les tribus du Nord, Benjamin tout particulièrement, se voient habilement reprocher de ne pas avoir fait la conquête de la Jérusalem des Jébuséens. Mais ce sont surtout les normes de conduite selon

un idéal deutéronomiste qui font l'objet de ce premier chapitre (19-57). O'Connell repère un cadre cyclique constitué de douze expressions présentes, en tout ou en partie, dans le corps du texte (Jg 3,7-16,31). Une série de tableaux faciles à consulter donne le texte hébreu de ce vocabulaire deutéronomiste. Un tableau-synthèse, à la fin du chapitre (55), explique la structure de l'«intrigue» («plot-structure»); les douze thèmes sont repris sous forme de schéma qui divise en deux blocs égaux les phases d'aliénation et de restauration en chacun des épisodes concernant les libérateurs ou sauveurs. O'Connell reconnaît que ce schéma est celui du rédacteur et non nécessairement celui des récits reçus et incorporés dans le livre des Juges.

Le ch. 2 («Rhetorical Concerns of Judges as a Literary Form», 58-267) distingue dans le livre des Juges dix parties (dont six pour 3,7-16,31, deux pour le prologue et deux pour le dénouement). Le double prologue met en évidence l'interaction entre l'occupation du territoire et la fidélité à l'alliance par le culte. Dans le reste du livre, le rédacteur souligne régulièrement que le malheur est venu de l'infidélité à YHWH, qu'un rôle particulier est dévolu à Juda, c'est-à-dire au roi qui en sera issu, que l'oppression venant des étrangers ne peut venir que de l'abandon du culte véritable et de l'abandon des normes de justice sociale. Sans doute, O'Connell accorde-t-il trop d'importance à 1,21, mais cela fait partie de sa thèse principale. Ce chapitre, corps de l'ouvrage, reprend toutes les allusions possibles aux formules signalées dans le ch. 1. Il est constellé de tableaux sur le déroulement de l'«action» en chacune des unités de lecture. Le lecteur moderne se demandera sans doute si O'Connell ne veut pas trop prouver. Les premiers destinataires du texte pouvaient-ils soupçonner l'existence de cette clé de lecture? Il reste que l'A. fait montre d'une connaissance approfondie du livre des Juges. De plus, il est au courant des études sur le sujet comme le montrent les nombreuses notes en bas de page et la bibliographie (486-504). Le rappel fréquent de la thèse principale, les mises au point et les résumés contribuent à clarifier un ouvrage par ailleurs assez fouillé. Dans ce chapitre, O'Connell n'a pas résisté à la tentation de donner ici et là une interprétation d'allure «psychologisante» (voir 188-189, par exemple, à propos de Jephthé).

À propos du double dénouement de Juges 17-21, O'Connell signale les correspondances entre ces chapitres et Deutéronome 12-13 (voir 230-265): l'idée est neuve, elle mérite sérieuse considération et, enfin, elle corrobore d'autres éléments de la «thèse». De plus, le fait que, en l'absence d'un roi, chacun faisait ce qui lui plaisait (17,6; 18,1; 19,1; 21,25) confirme selon O'Connell que prologue et dénouement font parties intégrantes du livre des Juges et que le «compiler/redactor» du livre suivait un plan déterminé, inspiré par les préoccupations deutéronomistes de son époque. Toutefois, il reste quelques problèmes en suspens à propos du cadre rédactionnel de Jg: la structure découverte dans le reste du livre n'apparaît pas dans le prologue (voir 58) et Jg 17-21 entraînent le lecteur dans un monde bien différent de celui de Jg 3-16. Malgré tout, l'A. montre qu'une thématique deutéronomiste pourrait bien faire le lien entre ces blocs de textes.

Avec le ch. 3 («The Rhetorical Strategy of Judges», 268-304),

O'Connell pousse sa thèse plus loin. L'emploi fréquent d'expressions qui atténuent la portée de ses jugements («perhaps», «may be», «some analogy», etc.) montre qu'il s'y trouve en terrain moins solide. En fait, le point de départ de l'argumentation est l'absence d'un roi. D'une part, le «rédacteur» soutient *explicitement* la monarchie (les quatre références: «il n'y avait pas alors de roi») et, de l'autre, il fait montre d'un «implicit monarchialism» qui apparaît si l'on compare la figure du «juge» en Jg 3-16 et celle du roi dans l'œuvre deutéronomiste sous les aspects de chef de guerre, de leader des douze tribus, de responsable du culte et arbitre de la justice sociale. La fin de la royauté de Saül et l'élection de David pourraient alors constituer un cadre idéal pour fonder cette analogie entre la période des Juges et la période suivante. O'Connell va jusqu'à suggérer que le «rédacteur» pourrait être le même pour Juges et pour 1 S 1-2 S 4.

Dans cette logique, O'Connell émet au ch. 4 («The Rhetorical Situation Implied by Judges», 305-342) l'hypothèse que le cadre idéologique qui permet de comprendre la rédaction du livre des Juges serait le tout début de la royauté de David, soit 2 Samuel 1-4: «a situation that had seen neither the rule of David extended to include the Ephraimite league of tribes nor the centralization of the cult in Jerusalem» (305). L'A. se défend de suggérer un cadre rigide, car il ne cherche pas un *Sitz im Leben* à connotation historique, mais bien un *Sitz im Text*, en «contexte canonique», ajoute-t-il (307). Ce genre d'étude, basé sur des parallèles bibliques, permet de déceler des rapprochements qu'on n'osait soupçonner. Le degré de probabilité de ces hypothèses nous laisse également libres de les accepter ou non. Il faut d'ailleurs remercier l'A. de fournir, tout au long de son travail, aussi bien les indices qui étayent sa thèse que les éléments qui ne concordent pas nécessairement avec elle. En cela, son travail est exemplaire et permettra de continuer la discussion.

Cependant, j'ai l'impression que les deux derniers chapitres, par un recours massif à des conjectures et hypothèses multiples, vont battre en brèche la confiance accordée jusque là à l'A. Dans une étude d'ordre strictement littéraire et rhétorique se font jour — même si on dit que c'est par le *Sitz im Text* — des préoccupations qui ramènent, qu'on le veuille ou non, au cadre historique. Peut-être est-il impossible de dissocier complètement cadre littéraire et cadre historique.

Le volume s'achève par un conclusion (343-344), deux «Excursus» et un «Appendix»: un état de la question concernant les recherches sur le livre des Juges (surtout diachroniques) («Excursus One: Compilation, Redaction and the Rhetoric of Judges», 345-368), un bref exposé de critique textuelle: texte et versions («Excursus Two: Scribal Developments and the Rhetoric of Judges», 369-384), et le texte hébreu du livre des Juges, disposé en trois colonnes (à gauche: la source; au centre: les textes empruntés aux livres des Nombres, Deutéronome et Josué; à droite: les textes attribuables au «compiler/redactor»; dans la marge de droite, un trait continu laisse voir ce qui peut venir d'une première rédaction, un double trait ce qui peut venir d'une deuxième rédaction [on y reconnaît la double rédaction deutéronomiste]) (385-432). Des notes, très bien documentées par ailleurs, viennent à la suite du texte hébreu («Redaction-Critical Notes», «Text-Critical Notes»). Texte hébreu et notes pourront rendre service, mais ils

orientent vers un type d'étude bien différent et n'ajoutent donc rien d'essentiel à ce travail. Une traduction du livre des Juges aurait sans doute été plus utile. J'ai aussi découvert une trentaine de coquilles dans le texte hébreu de cet appendice. En fin de compte, l'étude est fructueuse, malgré un style plutôt aride et quelques répétitions.

175, rue Main
Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 1C3 Canada

Léo LABERGE, o.m.i.

Aaron SCHAT, *Die Entstehung des Zwölfprophetenbuchs. Neubearbeitungen von Amos im Rahmen schriftübergreifender Redaktionsprozesse* (BZAW 260). Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1997. xi-346p. 16 x 23,5. Leinen: DM 178,—

This Marburg *Habilitationsschrift* (supervised by J. Jeremias) is an attempt to reconstruct the compositional history and concerns of the "Book of the Twelve Prophets" with a specific focus on the role of Amos within the broader context of the larger work. Schart argues that a literary-critical analysis of the book of Amos identifies the textual clues for a redaction-critical reconstruction of the various stages in the composition of the Book of the Twelve. These stages include an initial "two volume" work comprising earlier forms of Hosea and Amos; a "deuteronomic/deuteronomistic corpus" (DK) comprising early forms of Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah; an expansion of DK by a "Nahum-Habakkuk corpus" (NHK); an expansion of NHK by a "Haggai-Zechariah corpus" (HZK); a further expansion by a "Joel-Obadiah corpus" (JOK); and finally, the additions of Jonah and Malachi.

The methodological roots of this study lie in a self-conscious attempt to refine redaction-critical analysis in relation to recent advances in the synchronic literary study of biblical texts. Schart correctly recognizes that synchronic literary study of the final form of a biblical text is the indispensable basis for a diachronically-oriented redaction-critical reconstruction of its compositional history and its theological perspectives. The Book of the Twelve is the product of many authors who worked at various times and with various hermeneutical viewpoints. Redaction-critical work necessarily traces the literary rather than the oral stage of compositional growth. Consequently, the interpreter must examine closely both the smaller literary units that comprise the prophetic books and the sequence of their arrangement within the broader literary context as a basis for exegesis. The meaning of a text may change as it is transmitted and interpreted within the context of later redactions, and the interpreter must be prepared to examine a text in relation to the other prophetic books within the Twelve in order to give a full accounting of the impact of literary context on the interpretation of individual units.

Amos points to the beginning of the literary process of composition

in the Book of the Twelve in part because it appears to be the earliest of the constitutive prophetic books and because its primary themes, such as the Day of YHWH (see Amos 5,18-20; cf. Zeph 1,14; Joel; Mal 3,23) or the possibility of Israel's return to divine favor (see Amos 5,15; cf. Zeph 2,3; Joel 2,14) appear at other key points in the Twelve. The reconstruction of the various stages of Amos's literary development points to cross references between Amos and the other books of the Twelve that in turn provide the basis for successive expansions of both Amos and the Twelve as a whole.

Schart's work has tremendous potential for understanding both the Book of the Twelve and literary-critical exegetical methodology. Indeed, scholars have until recently paid very little attention to the interpretative possibilities provided by an analysis of the Twelve as a whole and the placement and function of its constituent prophetic books within that larger context. With respect to exegetical methodology, synchronic analysis ideally prevents the interpreter from falling into the trap of allowing views concerning the redactional history of the text to control his or her analysis, and it thereby provides a potentially far more secure basis for diachronic analysis and redaction-critical reconstruction. But one may question Schart at key points, e.g., does he pay adequate attention to the final form of the constituent prophetic books within the Twelve? Indeed, there are two major versions of the Book of the Twelve in the Masoretic and Septuagint texts. The different orders of the twelve books and the failure to reach consensus concerning the historical priority and hermeneutical outlook of either form suggests that the individual books functioned within, and perhaps entered, the Book of the Twelve as coherent entities in and of themselves. Furthermore, Schart's analysis tends to isolate individual textual units within the individual prophetic books and to relate them to individual units from other constituent books within the Twelve without full consideration of their own literary and formal characters. Such a procedure harks back to the methodological limits of older forms of redaction-criticism in which individual texts were isolated in relation to their immediate literary contexts and declared later additions, with little consideration as to how they helped to give shape to and to influence the interpretation of the larger text. Schart gives due consideration to the literary context of the Book of the Twelve, at least in its posited redactional stages, but he frequently gives inadequate attention to the literary shapes, concerns, and contexts of the individual prophetic books.

The weaknesses of Schart's approach are evident in his initial analysis of the book of Amos. At the outset, he notes the three-part structure for the final form of the book of Amos: the superscription in Amos 1,1 stands outside of the structure; the cycle of speeches concerning the nations appears in Amos 1,2-2,16; a collection of speeches against Israel appears in Amos 3-6; and a cycle of visions appears in Amos 7-9. Insofar as Amos 1,2-2,16 and 7-9 are parallel cycles concerned with the abuse of social justice, they form a frame for Amos 3-6. Overall, this is a very mechanical view of Amos's structure, which makes no attempt to understand the interrelationship between the various sections of the book or their rhetorical characters in relation to the whole. Basically, Schart treats the sub-units of

the book as "collections" of individual prophetic words that have been arranged within the text but show relatively little in the way of internal cohesion other than a common concern with the nations, Israel, or the prophet's visions. He provides little or no basis by which to account for the prophet's or the book's Judean identity or perspective over against that of the northern kingdom of Israel. This prevents the interpreter from recognizing the rhetorical concern of the whole to focus the (Judean) prophet's criticism on northern Israel and thereby to provide an argument throughout the book for the destruction of the Beth El sanctuary and the re-establishment of Davidic rule over the north.

Schart's exegesis of Amos therefore employs relatively little in the way of meaningful synchronic analysis. His assumption that the book is comprised of collections of Amos's short, self-contained, independent words as well as the later words of others controls his analysis. Individual words are easily separated from their literary contexts without full consideration of their place within those contexts. As a result, Schart's redaction-critical reconstruction tends to follow the models of older critics who gave exegetical priority to such small units. He maintains that an original collection of Amos's words against Israel appears in Amos 3-6; later tradents assembled the collections in Amos 1,2-2,16 and 7-9; a deuteronomic layer appears in Amos 2,4-5,10-12; 3,1b-7; 4,6-11*; 8,4-7; 9,7-10*, etc.; a hymnic layer appears in Amos 4,12-13; 5,8-9; 8,8; and 9,5-6; a salvation layer appears in Amos 9,11.12b.13aα.14-15; an eschatological layer in Amos 9,12a.13aβb; and a number of miscellaneous additions appear in Amos 2,7bβ; 2,14b.15aβ; 4,10b; 5,6.13; 8,9-10. The salvation and eschatological layers might look very different, however, when one considers that the Judean Amos might well call for the destruction of the Beth El altar and the restoration of Davidic kingship after having been obligated to bring a share of his own harvest to Beth El during the period that Judah was a vassal to the stronger kingdom of Israel. Likewise, the so-called "hymnic fragments" express an element of Judean identity and construction of YHWH that cannot be so easily separated as independent units within the book. Amos 5,8-9, for example, builds upon the call to return to YHWH in Amos 5,6.7 by identifying YHWH as the one who will destroy the unrighteous of Joseph and Beth El if they do not return. Must it be considered as a separate unit because it employs generically distinct hymnic language, or does the hymnic language function within a larger rhetorical and generic unit that points to YHWH the creator as the basis for an appeal to return before it is too late? The hymn gives substance to an otherwise meaningless threat.

Schart's discussion of the interrelationship between the posited early edition of Amos assembled by the prophet's tradents and an early form of Hosea shows the strengths of this study. Following Jeremias, he maintains that Amos's tradents understood the message of the southern prophet to be essentially the same as that of Hosea, and that they shaped an early form of Amos in relation to Hosea to create a two-volume prophetic work that formed the basis for the subsequent development of the Book of the Twelve. Key to his argument is an analysis of the narrative concerning Amos's encounter with Amaziah (and indirectly with Jeroboam ben Joash)

at Beth El, which indicates that Amos's tradents portrayed the prophet as an opponent to the northern monarchy who envisioned the possibility of Israel's deportation by the Assyrians. Such concerns are prominent in Hosea, and a series of other common concerns, lexical and thematic parallels, and the common use of the call to attention as a structural element enable him to make a case that the tradents of Amos knew Hosea in shaping the two-volume work. Schart places this work broadly in Judah from the time of Hezekiah's reforms to those of Josiah. One might refine his work by differentiating the positions of the two prophets more sharply. Amos opposes the Israelite monarchy because of its economic dominance of Judah whereas Hosea opposes Israel because of its alliance with Assyria, but both prophets agree in holding that the northern kingdom has abandoned YHWH. Nevertheless, he demonstrates that the two prophets might be read in relation to each other and in relation to the later concerns of the late-Judean monarchic period.

One might ask — and he does — why should not Micah be included to form a trio together with Amos and Hosea? Indeed, Micah is similarly concerned with the condemnation of Samaria and the northern monarchy as well as with the exile of the northern kingdom, although it holds up the experience of the north as a paradigm for that of the south. But the lack of direct lexical associations between Micah and Hosea-Amos, the absence of the calls to attention as structural markers in Micah, and the weak identification of Micah's statements as the word of YHWH indicate that Micah originally developed independently from Hosea-Amos. It was only later that a deuteronomistic redaction associated Micah with Hosea-Amos by adding an earlier form of Mic 6,2-16*, and thereby linked Micah to the dtr/dtn additions in Amos and Hosea. A literary-critical analysis of Zephaniah, much like that employed for Amos, identifies dtr material in Zeph 1,1; 1,4*.5-18aα; 2,4-6.8-9.12-15; 3,1-8; 2,1-3; and 3,11-13, that emphasizes humility. Eschatological redaction appears in Zeph 1,18aβb and 3,8bβ; the world-wide perspective of Zeph 1,2-3 corresponds to material in Nahum and Habakkuk; and supplementary texts appear in Zeph 3,9-10.14-20 that correspond to Deutero-Isaiah. The deuteronomistic material in Zephaniah is linked closely to that of Amos, particularly in relation to the motif of the Day of YHWH (Amos 5,18-20), and to the judgmental perspective of Mic 6,2-16*. Only brief lexical associations appear in Hosea, but the motif of YHWH's *rib* with Israel links dtr-Hos to dtr-Mic and thus to dtr-Zeph and dtr-Am. The four-part "D corpus" emphasizes the Day of YHWH against Israel, and indicates that it is relevant for Judah as well. In addition, it emphasizes the dtr concept of centralization in Zion over against Beth El, and the four books employ similarly formulated superscriptions. Like the two-volume Hosea-Amos work, the four-volume DK is placed broadly in the period from Hezekiah to Josiah. This, of course, raises the question whether Schart makes too fine a distinction between Hos-Amos and the DK. Likewise, the loose connections made between Hos and Zeph raise questions as to whether the four volumes can indeed be considered a coherent literary work as opposed to several independent compositions with similar concerns. Finally, the literary-critical analysis of Zephaniah is subject to the same criticism as that of Amos, viz., can one

differentiate on the basis of short snippets of texts the so-called *dtr* interest in the Day of YHWH from the so-called eschatological punishment of the earth, particularly since the Temple in Jerusalem was conceived as the center of all creation. Indeed, Deutero-Isaiah may presuppose Zephaniah rather than vice versa. Nevertheless, Schart's scheme points once again to the reading of these four prophetic books in relation to the concerns of the later Judean monarchy.

Having argued for the two main points of his thesis, Schart ties up loose ends by turning to his posited subsequent editions in the Twelve. The hymnic fragments of Amos and similar fragments in Hos, Mic, and Zeph are associated with the theophanic hymnic elements of Nahum and Habakkuk to form the NHK redaction of the Twelve, which is especially concerned with YHWH's role as universal creator and judge of nations. The concern with the rise of the fallen booth of David in Amos 9,11-15* is placed in the aftermath of the Babylonian exile and related to concerns for restoration in Haggai and Zechariah (and Mic 2,12-13; 4-5; Nah 1,12b; 2,1; Hab 2,14; Zeph 3,14-20) that build upon the judgmental perspectives of earlier prophets. The eschatologically-oriented Joel and Obadiah are linked to previously identified eschatological statements in Amos 9,13a^{bb}; 4,9; 9,12a and other such texts among the Twelve (e.g., Zech 9-13; 14; Zeph 3,8-10, etc.) to form an eschatological redaction that exegetes earlier prophetic literature, particularly in relation to a universal day of YHWH. Finally, the satirical Jonah is introduced to provide a view of YHWH's mercy that critiques Joel and other portrayals of YHWH's judgment, and Malachi is introduced to serve as a conclusion to the Book of the Twelve that builds upon the eschatological perspective of the JOK redaction but emphasizes the ethical dimensions of Mosaic Torah and prophecy. Unfortunately, Schart does not consider the potentially fruitful relationship between Malachi's reference to Torah and those in Hos 4,6; Amos 2,4 or Mic 4,2.

Despite the weaknesses discussed above, Schart's study points to some very interesting possibilities insofar as he seriously considers the overall form and concerns of the Book of the Twelve as a whole and the implications of an intertextual reading of its constituent books. His attempts to reconstruct the earliest redactional phases of the Twelve in the Hos-Amos and the D-redactions point to a well-considered concern with delineating the reading and application of prophetic literature in relation to the concerns of late-monarchic Judah. Such a concern helps to break down earlier theological constructs of a monolithically sinful Israel that was justifiably punished by YHWH, and emphasizes the social reality of a serious engagement with prophetic tradition and historical experience in ancient Judah that opens the way for the continued development of the tradition and its interpretation in the post-exilic period and beyond.

1325 N. College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711 USA

Marvin A. SWEENEY

Novum Testamentum

Irina LEVINSKAYA, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting* (The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 5). Grand Rapids, W.B. Eerdmans – Carlisle, UK, The Paternoster Press, 1996, xv-284p. 16 x 24. \$38.00

Seit 1993 hat sich ein internationaler Kreis von Althistorikern und Theologen zusammengefunden, die in einer auf 6 Bände konzipierten Reihe die Acta-Forschung neu vorantreiben und besonders das historische und literarische Umfeld untersuchen, um mehr Klarheit in die Beurteilung der Apg als Geschichtswerk zu bringen. Während die anderen Bände zumeist aus Beiträgen mehrerer Autoren bestehen, übernahm die junge russische Althistorikerin L. allein die Untersuchung der jüdischen Diaspora im großen Gebiet der von Lukas geschilderten urchristlich-paulinischen Mission. Angesichts des Umfangs des Themas hat sie vor allem die Form exemplarischer Darstellung und knapper Überblicke gewählt, aber dennoch versucht, die Quellen — jedenfalls im Hinblick auf die Inschriften — ausführlich heranzuziehen.

Als Ergebnis betont L., daß es ein Fehler war, die Apg als rein theologisches Konstrukt und nicht wie jedes andere historische Werk der Antike zu betrachten: Es gilt, nicht nur das theologische Konzept des Autors zu erkennen, sondern die Apg als "a valuable historical work" und bedeutende Quelle für die Geschichte des 1. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. ernstzunehmen (viii). Einer der Hauptgründe dafür, daß man der Darstellung des Lukas in der Apg mißtraut habe, sei — neben einer einseitigen Bevorzugung der paulinischen Briefe als Quelle — seine Darstellung der Gottesfürchtigen gewesen (52).

Für die jüdische Diaspora in Kleinasien und Griechenland besitzen wir keine mit der Apg vergleichbare ausführliche Quelle. Die beiden großen jüdischen Historiker dieser Zeit, Philo und Josephus, berichten von der jüdischen Bevölkerung Kleinasien und Griechenlands nur am Rande. Sie sind dabei vor allem am Verhältnis zum palästinischen Mutterland und seinem Tempel, zum römischen Staat und den rechtlichen Privilegien der jüdischen Gemeinden und ihrem Kampf um politische Gleichstellung in den Städten interessiert, aber nicht so sehr an ihrer inneren Struktur, der Beschreibung ihrer Gottesdienste und ihrer Teilnehmer. Diese Nachrichten müssen vor allem ergänzt werden durch die Briefe des NT und der apostolischen Väter, doch darauf geht L. nur selten ein.

Durch neue epigraphische und archäologische Funde ist die jüdische Diaspora in Kleinasien und Griechenland in letzter Zeit wieder stärker ins Interesse gerückt:

Vor, gleichzeitig und nach der Arbeit von L. sind erschienen: R. Riesner, *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus* (WUNT 71; Tübingen 1994) = *Paul's Early Period* (Grand Rapids – Cambridge 1998); P. Pilhofer, *Philippi. I. Die erste christliche Gemeinde Europas* (WUNT 87; Tübingen 1995); ders., *Philippi II.* (erscheint in WUNT 1999); C. Breitenbach,

Paulus und Barnabas in der Provinz Galatien (AGJU 38; Leiden u. a. 1996); M. Hengel – A.M. Schwemer, *Paul Between Damascus and Antioch* (London – Westminster 1997) = erweiterte Fassung: *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien* (WUNT 108; Tübingen 1998); B. Wander, *Gottesfürchtige und Sympathisanten* (WUNT 104; Tübingen 1998) behandelte unabhängig von L. das Thema (s. 137 Anm. 176). Die Untersuchungen von Wander und L. ergänzen sich gegenseitig.

Während für die jüdischen Inschriften aus Ägypten, Rom und der westlichen Diaspora durch das Cambridger Projekt neue Bearbeitungen vorliegen, die L. verwenden konnte, fehlt bisher ein neues Corpus der jüdischen Inschriften aus Kleinasien und Griechenland, das CII ersetzt. So ist es besonders verdienstvoll, daß L. den Schwerpunkt auf den Bereich der Epigraphik legt.

Im ersten Hauptteil (1-126) schildert L. das Selbstverständnis der Juden in der westlichen Diaspora und ihr Verhältnis zu Proselyten und Gottesfürchtigen und behandelt das Milieu der jüdischen Synagogen und ihres Umfeldes, in dem Lukas die Anfänge der christlichen Mission beschreibt. Der zweite Teil (127-196) untersucht die literarischen und epigraphischen Belege für einzelne Orte. Drei interessante Appendices ("Syncretism", "The Meaning of *Proseuche*", "Inscriptions of the Bosporan Kingdom") schließen den Band ab (197-246); sie werden ergänzt durch Tafeln der bosporanischen Inschriften (144-145) und Indices, die leider viel zu knapp gehalten sind.

L. beginnt mit der Betonung, daß die religiöse und ethnische Identität von Juden in der Diaspora ihre klare Definition nicht erst durch die Einführung des *fiscus Judaicus* erhielt (2-12). Die jüdischen Gemeinden in der Diaspora Kleinasiens waren sich der religiösen und ethnischen Schranke, die sie auch von den mit ihnen sympathisierenden Heiden trennte, wohl bewußt. Ein Mann konnte nur Jude sein, wenn er beschnitten war (11), aber auch die gottesfürchtigen Frauen blieben Heiden, wie der Fall der Lydia zeige, die den Apostel (und seine Begleiter) nach ihrer Taufe sehr bedrängen mußte, ihr Gast zu sein. Ein besonderes Problem bildeten in der Diaspora die Mischehen: Welchem Volk gehörten die Kinder an? Die Nachricht von der Beschneidung des Timotheus (Apg 16,1-3) ist der erste Beleg für die matrilineare Festlegung jüdischer Abstammung und zeigt zugleich, daß die im rabbinischen Recht später zur Norm gewordene Regelung zuerst in der Diaspora entwickelt wurde, wo Mischehen selbstverständlich häufiger waren als im Heiligen Land (12-17).

In der in den letzten Jahren heftig diskutierten Frage, ob es eine aktive jüdische Mission gab, entscheidet sich L. eindeutig negativ. Sie unterstreicht, daß gerade die Apg wohl die Hinwendung von Heiden zum Judentum berichtet, aber keine mit der Tätigkeit christlicher Apostel vergleichbare Mission. Dasselbe Bild ergebe sich aus den heidnischen und jüdischen, literarischen und epigraphischen Quellen. Die epigraphischen Zeugnisse für Proselyten listet L. kurz auf (25-26). Diese haben sich inzwischen vermehrt; vgl. W. Horbury, "A Proselyte's *HEIS THEOS* Inscription Near Caesarea", *PEQ* 129 (1997) 133-137; die griechisch-aramäische Ossuarinschrift aus Jerusalem ("Ariston aus Apamea. Juda der Proselyt", der wohl identisch ist mit dem m. Hal 4,11 erwähnten Träger des Namens Ariston)

von T. Ilan mitgeteilt in: *The Akeldama Tombs. Three Burial Caves in the Kidron Valley, Jerusalem* (ed. G. Avni/Z. Greenhut u.a.) (IAA Reports 1; Jerusalem 1996) 66, 68-70. Diese neuentdeckten Inschriften unterstreichen zudem den engen Kontakt zwischen der Diaspora in Syrien mit Jerusalem und die Rückwanderung in herodianischer Zeit; auf diese Aspekte geht L. nicht ein. Bei den literarischen Belegen beschränkt sich L. auf "those which are interpreted as evidence for aggressive proselytizing" (26). So entwirft sie ein zu einseitiges Bild und unterschätzt die Bedeutung der Proselyten für das jüdische Selbstverständnis gerade in der Diaspora. Die Feststellung, daß sich bei Philo nur wenige Belege für *προσήλυτος* finden (33), ist irreführend, denn er gebraucht *ἐπὶ ἄλλοις* im selben Sinn und verfügt über eine metonymenreiche Sprache, wenn er die Hinwendung von Heiden zum Judentum preist. L. übersieht weiter Praem 152 und vor allem 166: Drei "Parakleten" unterstützen die eschatologische Rückkehr der Diaspora: Neben den Gebeten und der Heiligkeit der Erzväter verdanken die Israeliten ihre Heimkehr einem "dritten Beistand", der mehr als die anderen das Erbarmen Gottes erweckt, das sind diejenigen, "die hingeführt wurden auf den rechten Weg" und zu den "Bundesschlüssen" (*σπονδὰς καὶ συμβάσεις* anstelle von *διαθήκαι*) und deren einziges Ziel es ist, "Gott zu gefallen wie Söhne dem Vater". Die Proselyten erhalten somit eine endzeitliche Funktion, die sie wertvoller in den Augen Gottes erscheinen läßt als die Erzväter.

Den Heiden standen die Synagogengottesdienste offen; hierzu lud man sie ein und warb für den ethischen Monotheismus des Judentums. Auf Josephus' Schilderung der Anziehungskraft der Synagogengottesdienste in Antiochien am Orontes (135) und die hohe Anhängerschaft unter den vornehmen heidnischen Frauen in Damaskus (124 Anm. 23) verweist L. später. Senecas "die Besiegten haben den Siegern (ihre) Gesetze auferlegt" (*victi victoribus leges dederunt*) ist eben kein "rhetorical commonplace" (28; doch vgl. 31), sondern voller Haß gegen die Anziehungskraft dieser Religion.

Zu oberflächlich behandelt L. das vielschichtige Problem der Proselyten und Sympathisanten bei Josephus und hält im Anschluß an Goodman und Neusner die Bekehrung des Königshauses von Adiabene für eine rein politische Sache (33). Doch Mt 23,15 hat wohl in der schrittweisen Bekehrung des Izates unter 'Anleitung' von Ananias und dem gesetzestrengeren Eleazar seine nächste Parallele. Dieses Wehewort prangert nicht, wie L. meint, die Konversion eines Juden zum Pharisäismus an (36-39, 46). Die spätere, übertragene Verwendung von *προσήλυτος* für Christen bei Justin und in der altkirchlichen Auslegung des AT läßt deutlich erkennen, daß die eigentliche Wortbedeutung für den vollständigen Übertritt zum Judentum schon lange festlag und im Bewußtsein blieb. Diese Stellen stützen die Auslegung L.s von Mt 23,15 genauso wenig wie die angeblich judenchristlichen Ossuarinschriften von Dominus Flevit (44-45). Auf Bagatti und Milik hätte sich L. nicht mehr stützen sollen; vgl. L.Y. Rahmani, *A Catalogue of Jewish Ossuaries* (Jerusalem 1994), den L. nicht eingesehen hat. Auch die Inschrift "Cresces Sinicerus. Judaeus proselitus" aus Rom (46) ist nicht auf einen Judenchristen zu deuten, sondern erklärt sich aus der Sitte, daß Männer beim Übertritt den Zweitnamen Juda annahmen.

Entsprechend bleibt die Deutung der viel diskutierten "(gott-) verehrenden Proselyten" (*σεβόμενοι προσήλυτοι*) in Apg 13,43 auf zum

Christentum konvertierte Heiden unbefriedigend (48). Im Gegensatz zu Apg 17,4.34 wird ja gerade nicht gesagt, daß sie gläubig geworden seien, sondern nur ihr — vorübergehendes — Interesse an der neuen Botschaft festgehalten. Lukas beschreibt in der Episode in Antiochien in Pisidien modellhaft den Übergang des Paulus (und Barnabas) von der Juden- zur Heidenmission. So spricht Paulus in seiner "Antrittspredigt" die Hörer in der Synagoge einerseits als Israeliten (V. 16) und Abrahams Söhne (V. 26), d. h. Juden und Proselyten (Abraham galt als der erste Proselyt), und andererseits als gottesfürchtige Heiden (Vv. 16.26: φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν) an. Nach der Beschreibung des vorbildlichen Gottesfürchtigen Cornelius in Kap. 10 und seiner Taufe durch Petrus ist "gottesfürchtig", φοβούμενος, hier eindeutig als Terminus gebraucht. Insgesamt wertet L. die Bedeutung von φοβούμενος zugunsten von σεβόμενος etwas ab und verfehlt damit eine besondere Nuance bei Lukas; vgl. dagegen H.-J. Klauck, "Gottesfürchtige im Magnificat?", *NTS* 43 (1997) 134-139. Zunächst erweckt Paulus Neugier bei Juden und besonders frommen Proselyten (σεβόμενοι προσήλυτοι). Die "vielen", πολλοί, die Lukas als Zahlenangabe anführt, bedeuten soviel wie sein stereotyp übertreibendes "alle", πάντες, vgl. V. 44: "fast die ganze Stadt"; dazu Hengel-Schwemer, *Paulus*, 220, Anm. 889. Gemeint sind mehrere Juden und mehr als ein Proselyt, aber nicht "masses of proselytes" (49). Wenn sich dann bei der heftigen Auseinandersetzung am nächsten Sabbat Paulus und Barnabas mit dem Zitat von Jes 49,6 den "Völkern/Heiden", ἔθνη, zuwenden, so sind dies die in der Predigt angesprochenen φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν. Der Zusammenhang ist nicht leicht zu durchschauen, weil Lukas hier vieles komprimiert, das er eigentlich schon in seinem Bericht über Antiochien am Orontes hätte mitteilen können, aber er will hier alles vereinen: Eine Anspielung auf die paulinische Verkündigung von der Rechtfertigung (V. 39) und die des Barnabas von der Gnade (V. 43 vgl. Apg 11,23), zugleich den Wechsel von der Bezeichnung der Gottesfürchtigen mit φοβούμενοι — wie sie im palästinischen Sprachraum üblich war (Josephus verwendet u. a. sensiblen durch antijüdische Polemik, um Mißverständnisse zu vermeiden, stets σέβομαι κτλ.) — zu σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν, wie sie von da an in der Apg erscheint für die sich weiter nach Westen erstreckende Mission. Wie L. zu Recht hervorhebt (53, 111, 246) haben diese eine deutliche Parallele in den Inschriften aus dem bosporanischen Reich; in den kleinasiatischen Inschriften erscheint der Terminus "gottesfürchtig" für die den Synagogen verbundenen Heiden verkürzt als θεοσεβής. Gleichzeitig schildert Lukas exemplarisch den erbitterten Konflikt, der sich zwischen christlichen Missionaren und Synagogengemeinden um die Anhängerschaft unter den Gottesfürchtigen entzündete. Hierzu findet man bei L. wichtige Beobachtungen.

"Luke has drawn a vivid picture of the God-fearers" (53), daß dies so ist — möchte ich hinzufügen —, bestätigt die Notiz Kol 4,11-14, wonach Lukas nicht "aus der Beschneidung", ἐκ περιτομῆς, d. h. kein Proselyt gewesen ist, sondern — was seine detaillierte Kenntnis des Judentums beweist — selbst ein Gottesfürchtiger gewesen sein muß. Dafür daß dieses "lebendige Bild" auch eines der Ziele seiner Darstellung ist, spricht die intendierte Leserschaft und die Widmung an den "wertesten Theophilus", worauf L. leider nicht eingeht. L. will auch nicht zwischen Gottesfürchtigen

und weiter am Rande stehenden Sympathisanten unterscheiden (52). Doch in Fällen wie Julia Severa und Poppäa sieht auch sie nur "a loose link" zum Judentum (123). Näherliegendes übergeht L.: So Sergius Paulus, der sich einen jüdischen Hofastrologen hielt und von Lukas als Sympathisant geschildert wird, der dann wohl gläubig, aber bezeichnenderweise nicht getauft wird. Dagegen behandelt L. die epigraphischen Belege zum Thema Gottesfürchtige gründlich (59-82). Aber in der Inschrift aus Amastris (215-219) ist "der Herrin Proseuche" und nicht "to Ge (?) sovereign ... having prayed" zu lesen; s. Hengel — Schwemer, *Paulus*, 255; M. Hengel, "Die 'auserwählte Herrin', die 'Braut' und die 'Gottesstadt'", erscheint in: *La Cité de Dieu. Die Stadt Gottes* (Hrsg. M. Hengel — S. Mittmann — A. M. Schwemer) (Tübingen 1999). L. unterstreicht jedoch richtig, daß die Aphrodisias-Inschrift berechtigt, die viel umstrittenen θεοσεβής-Inschriften auf die Gottesfürchtigen zu beziehen.

Hervorzuheben sind die Abschnitte "God-Fearers and the Cult of the Most High God" (83-104) und "God-Fearers: The Bosporan Kingdom" (105-116). Hier ist L. in der Materie völlig zu Hause und plädiert überzeugend dafür, die Inschriften von der Nordküste des Schwarzen Meeres für die Erforschung des jüdischen Umfeldes der Apg heranzuziehen, obwohl dieses Gebiet außerhalb von deren Bereich liegt.

Die Darstellung der einzelnen Städte bleibt in ihrer Auswahl dagegen unausgeglichene. So ist nicht einzusehen, warum nur Antiochien am Orontes, Ephesus, Milet, Antiochien in Pisidien, Ikonium, Thessalonike, Beröa, Athen, Korinth und Rom untersucht werden, aber Damaskus, die phönizischen Küstenstädte, Zypern (wo Apg 13,5 mehrere Synagogen in Salamis erwähnt), Tarsus (woher Paulus stammt und sich zwischen Apg 9,30 und 11,25-26 aufgehalten hat), Philippi (doch vgl. 2, 98, 100, 120) u. a. hier fehlen. Verständlicherweise sind die Abschnitte zu Antiochien am Orontes (125-135) und Rom (165-193) am ausführlichsten, hier fließen die Quellen reichlicher. Doch die Versicherung, *alle* Belege zu Antiochien berücksichtigt zu haben (127), erscheint in einer Untersuchung, die 4 Makk (und die Briefe des Ignatius) übergeht, etwas naiv. Gerade 4 Makk mit seiner Werbung für die jüdische Frömmigkeit, die sich manifestiert in der Tapferkeit der Märtyrer und sogar vom heidnischen König anerkannt wird (17,17.23-24; vgl. Josephus, *contra Ap.* 2,283), ergänzt die Nachrichten der Apg und des Josephus über die Situation in Antiochien.

Hätte L. die antiken Quellen noch gründlicher gelesen, wären ihr sehr viel mehr Stellen aufgefallen, die sie vor einzelnen Irrwegen bewahrt hätten. Insgesamt ist ihr ein anregender und wertvoller Beitrag zur Erforschung der Geschichte des antiken Judentums und frühen Christentums gelungen.

Liebermeisterstr. 12
D-72076 Tübingen

Anna Maria SCHWEMER

Mikael WINNINGE, *Sinners and the Righteous. A Comparative Study of the Psalms of Solomon and Paul's Letters* (ConBib NT 26). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1995. 372p. 15,5 x 23

Die Psalmen Salomos, in Westeuropa seit der Erstedition 1626 bekannt, sind in griechischer und syrischer Sprache erhalten, gehen aber auf ein hebräisches Original zurück. Interne Indizien weisen auf eine Abfassungszeit ca. 70 bis 40 v.Chr.; die klarsten historischen Anspielungen beziehen sich auf die Eroberung Jerusalems durch Pompeius 63 und seine Ermordung 48 v.Chr. Julius Wellhausen hatte sie den Pharisäern zugeschrieben (*Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer* [Greifswald 1874] 113), und Herbert Braun hatte an ihnen die Theologie der Pharisäer entwickelt ("Vom Erbarmen Gottes über den Gerechten", *ZNW* 43 (1950/51), 1-54), freilich indem er alle Aussagen unter dem Verdacht der "Heuchelei" gegen den Strich las. M. Winninge ist in der Frage der Zuweisung zwar vorsichtiger, kommt aber doch zu demselben m.E. durchaus gerechtfertigten Ergebnis (180). So oder so bieten diese Psalmen ein bisher wenig genutztes Reservoir für jüdische Strömungen in vorchristlicher Zeit, vielleicht die einzigen Eigentexte der Pharisäer vor der Mishna. Nicht nur die Psalmen 17 und 18 mit ihrer gegen die Hasmonäer gerichteten Wiederbelebung der Messiaserwartung sind hier wichtig, auch die besondere Rolle des regelmäßigen Fastens (cf. Lk 18,12) kann aus ihnen verständlich werden. 3,8 schreibt ihm sühnende Kraft vergleichbar dem Jom Kippur zu (cf. meinen Aufsatz "Paul and the Pharisaic Tradition", *JSNT* 36 [1989] 75-94). Das geht (gegen W. 41, 203) doch wohl über Sir 34,26 hinaus.

Auf eine knappe Einleitung (ch. 1; 1-8) folgt in einem ersten großen Hauptteil (ch. 2; 9-123) eine Analyse der Psalmen; ausführlich werden 2-4, 8-10, 13 und 17 vorgestellt, knapp die restlichen, jeweils mit einer Fülle an bemerkenswerten Details, die hier nicht im einzelnen aufgeführt werden können. Verwiesen sei lediglich auf die oft erörterte Crux in 17,32, wo die Handschriften *χριστὸς κύριος* lesen, W. mit eigentlich allen Auslegern *χριστὸς κυρίου* konjiziert.

Ch. 3 (125-180) führt die Ergebnisse der Analyse zusammenfassend weiter. Bereits dort hatte dem Gegensatz von Gerechten und Sündern ein besonderes Augenmerk gegolten. Die Hasmonäer und die Sadduzäer sind zwar deutlich als Sünder qualifiziert, doch geht die begriffliche Opposition nicht einfach in einer solchen historischen Identifizierung auf. Vielmehr gibt es auch "sündige Gerechte", etwa 17,5 "wegen unserer Sünden standen Sünder gegen uns auf", oder 9,7 "wem wirst du Sünden vergeben, wenn nicht denen, die gesündigt haben". So sind Gerechte diejenigen, die Gott Recht geben (z.B. 3,5) — eine solche aktive Verwendung von *δικαιοῦν* ist neu —, und Gerechte sind die, die bereit sind, entsprechend dem Gesetz zu leben (14,2). Große Bedeutung kommt dem Gedanken der Erziehung (*παιδεία*) zu als dem Mittel Gottes, die Gerechten zu leiten. Die Eigenbezeichnung *οἱ ὅσιοι*, hebräisch *חסידים* entsprechend, ist zwar bei vielen jüdischen Strömungen zu finden, trifft aber historisch auch für die Pharisäer als Träger dieser Psalmen zu. Sowohl die Identifikation der

Gegner als auch das theokratische Konzept, der Messianismus, das politische Verhalten, das Gesetzesverständnis, die Ethik, die Vorstellung von Prädestination und freiem Willen, von Auferstehung und ewigem Leben, wie wir das aus anderen Quellen über die Pharisäer kennen, u.a.m. finden sich auch hier. Das weckt Erwartungen auf den Vergleich mit Paulus, dem Theologen pharisäischer Herkunft, wie jeweils die Differenz von Sünde und Gerechtigkeit bestimmt ist.

Zuvor jedoch sichert Id. seine Analyse noch ab durch einen Vergleich mit anderen jüdischen Strömungen (ch. 4; 181-212). Nötig ist zunächst die Feststellung, daß die "sündigen Gerechten" der Psalmen nie als "Sünder" oder "Gesetzlose" bezeichnet werden, obwohl sie ja durchaus "Sündigen". Zu unterscheiden ist also zwischen "Sündigen" als Akt ("act") und "Sünder" als Zustand ("status"), wie es ansatzweise sonst nur im Buch Hiob geschieht. Gemeinsam ist freilich die Überzeugung, daß es Sündlosigkeit nicht geben kann, gemeinsam das Problem, wie die Gerechten trotz Sünden gerecht bleiben können. Der gelegentliche Hinweis auf das Buch Hiob (183) könnte m.E. weiter ausgeführt werden, denn der erste dieser Psalmen liest sich wie eine Gegengeschichte dazu, und auch sonst scheinen mir Rückbezüge nachweisbar. Das umfänglichste Kapitel, das über Paulus (ch.5 213-332) beginnt W. mit einer Standortbestimmung der neueren Paulusforschung (5.1; 213-240). Mit E.P. Sanders hält er "Teilhabe" ("participation") für den geeigneteren Begriff, die paulinische Vorstellung von Erlösung zu bestimmen, als den der "Rechtfertigung" (220). Diese sei zweitrangig gegenüber der Bekehrung als eines plötzlichen Überwältigtwerdens, historisch provoziert durch die Auseinandersetzungen um die Heidenmission. Nötig erscheint mir ein solcher Einstieg nicht, denn es relativiert ja vorweg den Vergleich, wenn Paulus mit seiner Bekehrung gleichsam abgeschnitten wird von seiner Biographie. Berechtigt scheint er mir aber auch nicht, denn sachlich ist der Themenkomplex der Rechtfertigung doch durch die Bekehrung aufgerufen, wenn Paulus seinen neuen Weg dem alten entgegenhalten mußte. So richtig es ist, daß Sünde und Gerechtigkeit nur in Taten und in Personen konkret werden, so ist und bleibt unter verschiedensten Aspekten ihre Differenz vor und nach der Bekehrung die zentrale Frage.

Zunächst (5.2 241-263) beschreibt W. nun die Bereiche, in denen Paulus überlieferte jüdische Sprache und darin enthaltene Urteile aufnimmt, z.T. auch überträgt, wie den Gebrauch von ἔθνη als Völker, als Heiden und nun auch Nicht-Christen (so 1 Kor 12,2), oder Gal 2,15 ("Juden, nicht Sünder aus den Heiden"), 1 Thess 4,5 ("die Heiden, die Gott nicht kennen"). Viele weitere Beispiele zeigen unter unterschiedlichen Aspekten Gemeinsamkeit mit der Terminologie der Psalmen Salomos.

Neu in der paulinischen Bestimmung der qualitativen Differenz von Gerechtigkeit und Sünde ist die Grundannahme, daß kein Mensch gerecht, alle, Juden wie Griechen, Sünder sind (5.3 264-313). Das geht weit hinaus über die ja in den Psalmen Salomos begegnende Aussage, daß Gerechte auch Sündigen, andererseits auch über die, daß alle Heiden Sünder sind. Die Analyse von Röm 1,16-5,21 belegt eine erstaunliche Nähe zu Aussagen und Denkbewegungen der Psalmen Salomos, in Übereinstimmung und in Differenz, die kulminiert in Röm 5,19, der Aussage, daß alle Menschen Sünder sind (Zustand), nicht nur Sündigen (Akt). Dem entspricht, daß

Paulus nicht von "Sündigen Gerechten" im Sinne von PsSal 9,6-7 spricht, wohl aber von gerechtfertigten Sündern. Einleuchtend sind die von W. aufgezeigten Beziehungen der Vorstellung vom Gesetz als *παίδεργός* (Gal 3,24) zum Thema der Erziehung in den Psalmen Salomos. Über W. hinaus läßt sich m.E. aber auch eine wichtige Gemeinsamkeit insofern feststellen, daß Paulus in Röm 3,9-20 die Sprachform der Exhomologese aufnimmt. Er bietet eine Kette von Zitaten aus alttestamentlichen Psalmen dieser Thematik, die hinzielt auf die mit Ps 143,1-2 formulierte Erkenntnis, daß kein Mensch gerechtfertigt wird vor Gott aus Werken des Gesetzes.

Wie können Sünder gerecht werden? (5.4 314-320) Von E.P. Sanders übernimmt W. den Begriff des Wechsels ("transfer"), wofür Stellen wie 1 Kor 6,11; Röm 6,17-18; 3,26 zu nennen sind, die von Rechtfertigung im Zusammenhang der Taufe und des Herrschaftswechsels sprechen. W. läßt Gerechtigkeit aber darin nicht aufgehen, wie Röm 5,1-11; 9,30-33 zeigen. Neu sei bei Paulus aber diese Verbindung der Rechtfertigung mit dem Wechsel. M.E. hätte dies mit 2 Kor 5,21 durchaus noch deutlicher christologisch belegt werden können: "der keine Sünde kannte, den hat er für uns zur Sünde gemacht, damit wir Gerechtigkeit Gottes in ihm *würden*". Andererseits wäre vielleicht auch hier der bereits erwähnte Aspekt der Exhomologese zu bedenken, der als solcher ja Paulus und die Psalmen Salomos verbindet.

Wie können schließlich Gerechte gerecht bleiben? (5.5 321-332) Bei Paulus fehlt jeder Gedanke einer wiederholten Sühnung über den Tod Christi hinaus, und nur wenige Texte wären hier zu nennen im Unterschied zu dem beherrschenden Thema der Erziehung in den Psalmen Salomos: 1 Kor 5,3-5; 11,29-32; 2 Kor 2,6-7; 7,9-11. Daß der Bereich der Ethik von W. nur so kurz und fast anhangsweise behandelt wird, obwohl er zuvor öfters darauf verwiesen hatte, wird seinen Grund darin haben, daß "Gerechtigkeit" bei Paulus kaum als ein ethischer Leitbegriff zu finden ist. Zu nennen wäre hier allenfalls Röm 14,17. Röm 6,12-13 aber ist nicht so eindeutig, wie es bei W. (321) scheinen mag. Auch "Sünde" als Zustand wie als Akt ist ja nicht einfach in ethischen Kategorien zu verstehen. Die ebenfalls öfters angesprochene Dimension des endzeitlichen Gerichts klingt in diesem Schlußteil nur noch an. Auf den beiden Seiten des Schlußkapitels (ch. 6; 333-334) wird der Ertrag der Arbeit in die knappe These gefaßt, daß es für Paulus wie für die Psalmen Salomos, also für die pharisäische Tradition, aus der er kommt, um "sündige Gerechte" geht. Ich würde das dahingehend modifizieren, daß Paulus dieses Konzept umgestaltet in das der "gerechtfertigten Sünder". Das mindert nicht die Anerkennung für die von W. vorgelegte Arbeit, eine theologische Dissertation an der Universität Uppsala. Erstmals in dieser Intensität werden die Psalmen Salomos wahrgenommen als Träger einer konsistenten Theologie, und erstmals wird die paulinische Theologie in dieser Weise auf Traditionen bezogen, die seiner Herkunft aus den Pharisäern entsprechen können. Insofern markiert das Buch geradezu einen Paradigmenwechsel, und es ist der Paulusforschung zu wünschen, daß sie diese Arbeit so ernst nimmt, wie es ihrem Rang entspricht.

Gerhard HOTZE, *Paradoxien bei Paulus*. Untersuchungen zu einer elementaren Denkform in seiner Theologie (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen – Neue Folge 33). Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 1997. xiii-380p. 16 x 24. Gebunden: DM 98,—

The letters of Paul are replete with expressions in which two contrasting concepts stand in tension with one another, like power in weakness or life in death. In this slightly revised 1995 dissertation from the Catholic Faculty of Theology in Münster, with Professor Karl Kertelge as Doktor Vater, Gerhard Hotze examines one of the most important rhetorical figures in the New Testament, namely the paradox. For Hotze the Pauline paradoxes are not just rhetorical figures, but deeper structures of thought, *Denkformen*, which point to Paul's own experience of living the life of the crucified Christ in the world.

Hotze's starting point is consciously theological, noting that paradox this century through the influence of Søren Kierkegaard and Karl Barth has become a basic theological paradigm or *Denkform*. His aim is to contribute to the growing interest in paradox as a key theological concept through a detailed exegetical investigation of paradox as to form and content, an investigation which he notes has hitherto not been done. He chooses the Pauline letters because Paul more than any other biblical author uses paradoxes to express his message.

Since the study focuses on a concept and its linguistic expression the definition of paradox is crucial. Hotze defines paradox in a narrow logical sense as a proposition that is both true and false at the same time (28). In a wider sense a paradox is a phenomenon that contradicts the common understanding of an issue (26). Such paradoxes can be both *sprachliche* and *vorsprachliche* and both are of interest for Hotze. This wider definition of paradox is congruent with the etymology of the word as "contrary to opinion", and in the interpretation of texts this is the more important. Classical rhetorical tradition made a distinction between *res* and *verba*, between content and verbal expression. Consequently Hotze makes a distinction between the paradoxical nature of a thing (paradoxes of *inventio*) and paradoxes that through their verbal expression aim at a certain rhetorical effect (paradoxes of *elocutio*). Most of the Pauline paradoxes he discusses are rhetorical figures, but Hotze attempts to reach behind the *elocutio* to the *res*, the Pauline theology expressed in the paradoxes of *inventio*.

The first part of the book attempts to understand gradually Paul's use of paradox. Chapter 1 examines paradoxes in contemporary Greek sources and other biblical texts. Chapter 2 lists Paul's use of figures of speech (paraphrase, paronomasia, negative distinction, zeugma) and figures of thought (oxymoron, chiasm, hyperbole, irony and rhetorical questions) before he reaches his real concern, i.e. paradox as a theological structure of thought, or *Denkform*. Here he formulates the thesis: "Dreh- und Angelpunkt der paulinischen Theologie ist das Bekenntnis zu Christus, dem Gekreuzigten und Auferstandenen. Die aus diesem christologischen Kerygma von Tod und Auferweckung Jesu entwickelte Kreuzestheologie

und Eschatologie sind der ‚Sitz im Leben‘ wenn nicht aller, so doch der meisten theologischen Paradoxien bei Paulus”.

The second and main part of the book, 202 pages, examines in detail six Pauline passages. Chapter 3 studies 1 Cor 4,9-13; 2 Cor 11,2b-12,10 and Phil 3,7-11 as examples of paradoxes concerning “power in weakness”. Chapter 4 studies 2 Cor 4,7-12; 6,8-10 and 1,3-11 as paradoxes of “death and life”. The first type of paradox is an expression of Paul’s theology of the cross, the second of his eschatological understanding of the Christian life. The book concludes with a 20-page final chapter about the theological significance of the Pauline paradoxes which formulates the results in ten summarizing theses.

Methodologically the study brings nothing new. There is no discussion of method and the study proceeds along steps that used to be called the exegetical method: I Translation; II Analysis of (1) Context, wider as well as immediate, (2) Structure, (3) *Gattung*; III Interpretation, (1) Verse by verse, (2) Summary. The many steps each text has to undergo guarantee the detailed investigation Hotze has set out to accomplish. He repeatedly emphasizes the rhetorical situation, *Kommunikationssituation*, and the relationship between Paul and his addressees. His interest is not, as in some historical-critical interpretations, the *religionsgeschichtliche* background to textual features or Pauline autobiography; instead it is the rhetorical function of the paradoxes and any underlying theology.

Hotze is well acquainted with the German exegetical tradition, but not with the literature in English. The main weakness of the book is that Hotze seems to be unaware of the recent resurgence of rhetorical criticism in biblical studies. His overview of the rhetorical understanding of paradoxes ends with the studies by Norbert Schneider, *Die rhetorische Eigenart der paulinischen Antithese* (Tübingen 1970) and Josef Zmijewski, *Der Stil der paulinischen “Narrenrede”* (BBB 52; Köln 1978). Following Hans-Dieter Betz’s 1974 SNTS presentation in Sigtuna and his subsequent commentary on Galatians (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1979) rhetorical analysis has become one of the fastest growing approaches in biblical studies. In the eighties the interest was in the structure of biblical texts, the *dispositio*, and in the nineties the interest has turned to the text’s power of persuasion, the *inventio*.

Since Hotze is interested in rhetorical function he would have done well to consult some of the literature found for example in Duane Watson’s *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method* (Leiden 1994). An article that might have been particularly helpful is the one by Andreas H. Snyman describing methodological re-orientation for the study of rhetorical figures: “On Studying the Figures (*schêmata*) in the New Testament”, *Bib* 69 (1988) 93-107. Snyman shows how Chaim Perelman’s and Lucille Olbrechts-Tyteca’s *New Rhetoric. A Treatise on Argumentation* (Notre Dame 1969; French original 1958) provides new ways of understanding rhetorical figures not as mere embellishment, but as rhetorical devices with argumentative function. Paradox for example is part of the argumentative procedure of dissociation in which concepts that were previously attached become dissociated, thus creating new meaning.

Hotze seems to hold an outdated understanding of rhetoric as primarily concerned with stylistics. His interest in the rhetorical function would have been well served by the current understanding of rhetoric in rhetorical criticism as concerned with argumentation. Part of this new understanding is to question the distinction between *res* and *verba*, so central to the secondary rhetoric of Quintilian, and instead return to the primary rhetoric of the Greeks, where persuasion is the goal. Hotze seems to presume that Paul had a *vorsprachliche* theology which he dresses in words. I would agree that Paul has central theological convictions, pre-eminently the belief in the death and resurrection of Christ, but I would emphasize the contextual nature of Paul's theological statements (cf. my *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians* [Stockholm 1998]). The paradoxical nature of the texts Hotze studies in the Corinthian correspondence, I would maintain, is largely due to Paul's conflict with his Corinthian adversaries. The theology is created in this context. Part of the creative contextual task is to bring in arguments from the inherited kerygma and from Paul's own life, but these paradoxes are not the result of a theological reflection *per se*.

In each text studied Hotze asks two questions: (1) In what way is this text paradoxical? (2) How can we understand the paradox theologically (181)? With my rhetorical perspective I would instead have asked for the rhetorical function of the paradoxes in the argumentation. Hotze's procedure brings him too fast and too uncritically to the theology behind the words. Is the reason for the Foolish Discourse in 2 Cor 11,21b–12,10 really the one Paul himself claims, i.e. that Paul's weakness should manifest the power of Christ? Hotze mentions the passage as one where Paul's theology of the cross is formulated in words. Is not Paul's use of irony here due rather to the difficult rhetorical situation which forces him to use these paradoxical expressions as his rhetorical strategy? (So G. Holland, "Speaking Like a Fool: Irony in 2 Corinthians 10–13", *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference* [eds. S. Porter and T. Olbricht] [JSNTS 90; Sheffield 1993] 250–264)

My critical comments are greatly influenced by my own experience of theological studies at a Protestant theological faculty which separates exegesis from systematic theology to such an extent that the two almost never meet. Hotze's study on the other hand is a good example of bringing exegesis and theology together. As such the Pauline paradoxes are well suited for study as prime examples of a gospel message about Christ the crucified and risen, a message that is paradoxical in the sense that it goes against the understanding of spiritual things in an unbelieving world.

Allhelgona Kyrkogata 8
Teologiska Institutionen
S-223 62 Lund

Anders ERIKSSON

Varia

Nicolas WYATT, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*. The Words of Ilmilku and his Colleagues (The Biblical Seminar 53). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 500p. 15,5 x 23,5. £22.95 – \$35.00

This is a copiously annotated translation of fifty Ugaritic texts, complete with a bibliography and a brief yet informative introduction to each text. In addition to the stories of Baal, Kirta, Aqhat, Rapauma, Shahr wa-Shalim, and Nikkal wa-Ib, the work includes some thirty other mythic-ritual texts, some of which are of special interests, such as the banquet of El (KTU 1.114), the incantation against snake-bite (KTU 1.100), and the Pantheon lists (presented as a synopsis of KTU 1.47, 1.118, and the Akkadian text RS 20.24). The Ugaritic text is not given alongside the translation.

Wyatt's book presents more materials than the recently published similar work *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (SBL Writings from the Ancient World 9; 1997), which is a joint work by M. S. Smith, S.B. Parker, E.L. Greenstein, Th. J. Lewis, and D. Marcus. On the other hand, since it also includes the full Ugaritic text alongside the translation, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* may occasionally prove more practical. These two recent works thus can complement one another. Generally speaking, the SBL translation prefers consensus to controversies. Wyatt's tends to add different other proposals, especially in places where practically nothing can be said with certainty. Hence the obscure *hrb mlht* now appears as 'jaw-shaped knife', the conventional rendering being 'salted knife' or 'sharpened knife'. The pair *lim* and *hmlt*, generally understood as 'people' and 'multitude', become two new epithets of Baal 'The Powerful One' and 'The Tempest'. The unclear form *mšrltm* is translated as 'two inflamed ones'. Following de Moor's suggestion, the shadowy *rpum* is rendered as 'saviours'; but de Moor also adds that the literal meaning is 'healers'. These are only a few examples where the renderings, attractive as they are, should be considered as an attempt to give some sense to the translation if not to the Ugaritic text.

Given the incomplete state of preservation of most of these texts, it is natural that translators produce different renderings and will continue to do so. Wyatt fairly consistently records other proposals, with or without further discussion. Upon closer scrutiny some of his own interpretations are more problematic. A case in point is the rendering of the verbal forms at the beginning of KTU 1.17.I:1-5 *ylhm*, *yšqy*, *yd*, *y'l*, *wyškb*, *yd*, *yn*. Most translators understand these verbs as indicative and render them as the historical present tense or the preterite. Wyatt, following Jirku and Caquot, interprets them as a series of instructions (250-252): '...let Danel ... let the hero...feed the gods... give the holy ones to drink. Let him take off his robe, go up and lie down, take off his clothes and go to bed.' But it is very unlikely that the verbs are in the jussive mood since the narrative particles *apnk...aphn* 'then...thereupon' require the past tense interpretation

of the verbs. See 17.II:27-29 *apnk dnil / mt rpi aphn ġzr mt / hrnmy alp ytbh*-rendered by Wyatt in the past tense 'Then Danel the ruler of Rapha, at once the hero, the devotee of Hrn̄m, slaughtered an ox....' (265). Compare KTU 1.20.II:7-8 *wyʿn dnl [mt rpi] / ytb ġzr mt hrnmy* 'and Daniel, the man of Rapiu spoke up, the hero, the man of Hrn̄m replied'.

At KTU 1.2.IV:28-29 Athtart urges Baal to finish off Yamm, saying out loudly: *bṯ laliyn b[ʿl] / bṯ lrkb ʿrpt* rendered as 'Dry (him) up, O Valiant Baal! Dry (him) up, O Charioteer of the Clouds!' (68). To confirm the interpretation, the note mentions Isa 19,5 *wʿnāhār yehʿrab wʿyābēš* 'and River is dehydrated and dries up' giving due credit to Margaret Barker. Hence Wyatt posits the existence of a hitherto unattested Ugaritic verb *ybt* 'to be dry'. Yet comparative Semitic phonology would point to *ybs* rather than *ybt*. Though not ignored, this issue does not seem to be taken too seriously. But even granting that for some obscure reason the word appears in Ugaritic as *ybt*, the form would have been an imperative of D, which, as a genuine I-Yodh verb, would still exhibit the initial Yodh, quite unlike original I-W verbs. The usual interpretation of *bṯ* as 'Scatter!', imperative of *btt* (compare the Arabic cognate) is still better even if it is not attested elsewhere. At least this interpretation does not go against grammar and phonology.

One also gets the impression that here and there Wyatt reads too much into the text. A case in point is the treatment of the well-known passage on the duties of a son in KTU 1.17.I:25 etc. The line that starts with *wykn bnh bbt* is rendered on p. 255 as 'so that he may beget a son in his house'. But this does not do justice to the meaning of *kwn* which is simply 'to be'. With *lh* 'to him', the verb acquires the sense of 'to have'. Compare the expression *it ly* 'there is to me', i.e., 'I have...'. Accordingly, a more accurate rendering will be 'Let him have a son in (his) house.' There is no need to speculate that *kwn* is used 'in its sexual sense: beget' (255, n. 23). The same note suggests that this is the first of the seven expectations. The other six expectations concern the duties of a son. But the wish to have a son is not the same as what one expects from that son. After all, what is wrong with these six duties so that one needs to think of a series of seven wishes? If symbolism is the case here, the six duties of a son may also evoke the double completeness of his duties, six being the double of three. But associative interpretations like this usually fall all too easily to all kinds of speculation.

Another example of a rendering that goes a bit too far is found at KTU 1.100:64 *ydy bʿsm ʿrʿr* 'He uprooted from among the trees the tamarisk' (385). Despite the object, i.e., the tamarisk tree, the idea of uprooting cannot be part of the meaning of the verb *ydy* 'to cast off, to expel, to throw away'. Perhaps 'to fell' will evoke a less hyperbolic imagery without twisting too much the meaning of *ydy*. The previous eleven occurrences of the verb *ydy* in the same text are consistently and correctly rendered as 'let him cast out (the poison)', which falls within the meaning of the verb.

The first two lines of KTU 1.96: *ʿnn hlkt wšnwt tp ahh* are translated, following Del Olmo Lete, as 'The Evil Eye roves about and disfigures the beauty of its brother, i.e., the other eye' (375). Other translations usually

read *ʿnn* as *ʿnt*, the Goddess Anat, taking the last two strokes of the second *n* as an error. Wyatt thinks that the two strokes were added by the scribe precisely to have the letter *n*. This suggestion is interesting but there is a grammatical problem which is touched upon only indirectly in note 3 on p. 375. The form *ʿnn*, if understood as /ʿēn-/ 'eye' + the ending /-ānu/ will behave as a masculine noun regardless of the feminine base. But the verbs of which this form must be the subject (*hlkt*, *šnwt*, *tspi*, *tšt*) hardly favor such a reading since they are all in the feminine. Again, the suggestion in the same note that the two eyes are like brother and sister is thought-provoking albeit unconvincing, to say the least.

Here are several other points of disagreements. KTU 1.13:10 ('and lie down on your mountain Inbub) *kt ḡrk ank ydʿt*, usually rendered as 'at the foot of your mountain I know' appears as 'Come to your mountain I know' (170) reading the broken beginning of the *k*, with some other scholars, as *a*. The difficulty with this reading is that in Ugaritic the verb *rw* 'to come' needs a preposition when a locative complement is present as in KTU 1.15.III:18 *tity ilm l-ahlm* 'the gods arrived at their tents'. Again, it is surprising to find that KTU 1.19.IV:5 *ʿwrt yštk bʿl*, which is usually translated as 'May Baal make you blind' appears here as 'May Baal make your wells dry!' (307) without any explanation. Perhaps the blinding of eye, which in Ugaritic can also mean 'well' is understood as a metaphor for the drying of wells. But nowhere the word for 'eye', *ʿenu*, is mentioned. At least some note should have been given. If it is not merely an oversight, the translation of KTU 1.41 line 52 *klbh* as 'with all his heart (the king shall s[peak])' (354) is a bit too idiomatic for 'according to his heart', i.e., according to the king's wish.

Far from any intention to express mere disagreements, the above discussions show that this new addition to Ugaritic studies merits a serious consideration. At every turn Wyatt presents himself as a passionate guide who generously shares his amply documented knowledge of Ugaritic texts in such a way that his readers may form their own judgement. And for this service the book deserves a sincere welcome.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Agustinus GIANTO

Sabino CHIALÀ, *Libro delle parabole di Enoch*. Testo e commento (Studi biblici 117). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1997. 373 p. 13,5 x 21. Lit. 50.000

Giovane monaco della Comunità di Bose, laureato in ebraico all'Università di Torino e dottorando in filologia e storia orientali all'Università Cattolica di Lovanio, Sabino Chialà ha prodotto un eccellente lavoro su di una discussa sezione del celebre apocrifo giudaico noto come *Enoch etiopico*. Finora i capitoli 37-71 di questo scritto, comunemente etichettati come «Libro delle parabole» (anche se quest'ultimo termine trova nel testo

enochico un uso improprio), a quanto pare non erano ancora stati fatti oggetto di una indagine come la presente. Quindi il lavoro di Chialà ha certo il merito dell'originalità. Egli ha tradotto *ex novo* dall'originale etiopico l'intero testo, provvedendolo di note critiche, premettendovi una buona introduzione (19-82) e facendolo seguire da un abbondante commento (139-291), oltre che da due *Excursus* (293-340).

Vorrei subito mettere in rilievo l'importanza che questa parte di apocrifo riveste per il Nuovo Testamento soprattutto per quanto riguarda l'espressione «Figlio dell'uomo» ivi applicata a Gesù. Ricorrente quasi esclusivamente nei Vangeli, gli studiosi discutono se essa rappresenti un vero titolo (cristologico) o appartenga in senso generico al semplice linguaggio quotidiano. La questione è aggravata dal fatto che, a prescindere dal Libro delle Parabole di Enoch, l'espressione evangelica non avrebbe altri antecedenti, se non quella del libro di Daniele (aram. בֶּר אִישׁ, usato in 7,13 per una figura celeste di giudice escatologico ma dalle dimensioni collettive e in più introdotta solo come paragone) e del libro di Ezechiele (ebr. בֶּן אָדָם, usato spesso come appellativo per la figura individuale del profeta). Il nostro Libro, nell'ipotesi di una sua composizione precristiana (che certamente non potrebbe comunque essere di molto anteriore), costituirebbe l'anello mancante tra la letteratura profetica e il N.T.

Orbene nelle Parabole, impennate attorno alla figura preesistente e insieme escatologica di un luogotenente celeste di Dio stesso alla maniera di Daniele, questo personaggio riceve di fatto quattro titoli: «Giusto» (38,2.3; 53,6; Chialà esclude questo valore titolare in 47,1, dove il singolare avrebbe solo valore collettivo in base al seguente v. 2), «Eletto» (39,6; 45,3.4; 51,3.5; 52,6.9; 53,6; 55,4; 61,5.8.10; 62,1), «Messia» (48,10; 52,4) e appunto «Figlio dell'uomo» (46,2.3.4; 48,2 [il cap. 48 ne dà la descrizione più ampia, anche in rapporto alle altre designazioni]; 69,29bis; il titolo ha un sinonimo in «Figlio della madre dei viventi»: 62,14; 63,11; 69,26.27; 71,17). Se in 60,10 «Figlio dell'uomo» è semplice allocuzione rivolta a Enoch con il valore stemperato di «uomo» alla maniera di Ezechiele, invece in 71,14 l'angelo dice allo stesso Enoch: «Tu sei il Figlio dell'uomo, che sei stato generato per la giustizia», come se si trattasse di una identificazione ufficiale con la semplice figura del patriarca. Chialà discute sufficientemente questo passo (288-291), distinguendo tra la funzione propria del personaggio fondamentale del libro e la sua assegnazione parziale a esaltazione di Enoch (come in *Jub.* 4,23; 10,17), e facendo comunque rilevare come questo testo ponga serie difficoltà a chi vorrebbe vedere nelle Parabole un'opera cristiana. L'Autore infatti a p. 316 distingue ottimamente tra un primo livello di interpretazione della metafora, in cui essa si trasforma in un personaggio che agisce in proprio anche se per delega, e un secondo livello di interpretazione, in cui il personaggio riceve in aggiunta un volto umano, come avviene ripetutamente in vario modo: nelle Parabole il volto è quello di Enoch, nei Vangeli è quello di Gesù, e poi nel Testamento di Abramo è quello di Abele. In più, bisognerebbe notare che solo nei Vangeli il personaggio riceve il volto di un personaggio, che non è tratto dal passato (addirittura prediluviano) ma è quello di un uomo storico contemporaneo.

In effetti, il problema forse più dibattuto a proposito delle Parabole di

Enoch riguarda la sua datazione. Si ricordi che J.T. Milik, il quale pubblicò nel 1976 i frammenti aramaici delle sole altre quattro parti del pentateuco enochico trovati a Qumràn, datava le Parabole addirittura alla fine del secolo III d.C. Il nostro Autore si oppone questa ipotesi e adotta come criterio quello già proposto nel 1946 da E. Sjöberg, il quale assumeva come *terminus a quo* l'individuazione nel cap. 56 di un'allusione all'invasione partica avvenuta in Palestina nell'anno 40 a.C. Ciò porta il Chialà a «datare il libro delle parabole alla fine del I secolo a.C. o al massimo agli inizi del I secolo d.C.» (77). Va tuttavia rilevato che poi a p. 241 (a commento di 56,5), egli afferma che «non è da escludere la possibilità che la menzione di un'invasione di Parti e Medi sia nient'altro che un *topos* letterario tipico del linguaggio apocalittico». Ne risulta purtroppo che questa seconda affermazione infirma la prima, rimettendola in discussione. Del resto, si sarebbe amato vedere citate le fonti che attestano l'invasione partica avvenuta nel 40 a.C. e non limitarsi a citare il solo Sjöberg che l'ha richiamata.

Così pure sarebbe stato utile unire insieme tutte le ragioni che in ogni caso inducono l'Autore a ritenere fermamente la composizione precristiana dell'opera. Giustamente egli alle p. 194-195 rileva che le somiglianze non toccano mai il vero nucleo del cristianesimo, come l'incarnazione o la morte del Messia. Infatti, a differenza dei Vangeli, nelle Parabole il titolo di Figlio dell'uomo è esclusivamente attribuito a un personaggio celeste (tale è comunque il caso anche di Enoch nei succitati passi 60,10; 71,14) e mai invece a una figura dai contorni terreni; in più, il protagonista delle Parabole è del tutto alieno da un qualsivoglia destino di sofferenza e di morte, contrariamente a quanto avviene per Gesù. Si potrebbe aggiungere che, dei tre ambiti evangelici individuati già da Bultmann, in riferimento ai quali ricorre la qualifica in bocca a Gesù (e cioè il ministero terreno, il racconto della passione, e la funzione giudiziale escatologica), solo il terzo ha un parallelo nelle Parabole, mentre i primi due sono totalmente assenti (almeno nell'ipotesi che, come detto sopra, l'espressione «il sangue del giusto» in 47,1 si riferisca per *sineddoche*, come pare doversi sostenere, all'insieme dei giusti; del resto, qui eventualmente il titolo in questione sarebbe soltanto quello di Giusto).

L'*Excursus* finale sulla evoluzione dell'espressione (303-340), pur essendo piuttosto veloce (per esempio non tratta della fonte Q), fa chiarezza sui vari significati da essa assunti nella storia e, come ulteriore prova contro l'opinione di Milik, fa opportunamente notare che già al volgere del secolo I d.C. il linguaggio sul Figlio dell'uomo è attentamente evitato nella letteratura sia giudaica (il *4Esd.* propriamente non ne parla) sia cristiana (a parte il silenzio totale di Paolo, anche l'Apocalisse di Giovanni ne attesta di fatto un disuso almeno rispetto al Libro delle Parabole e ai Vangeli).

Un punto particolarmente discutibile del lavoro di Chialà riguarda la sua interpretazione del giudizio finale. Egli sostiene che tale giudizio terminerà col castigo solo degli angeli ribelli, cioè le schiere di Azazel, come veri responsabili del male nel mondo; anzi, nel cap. 55 Dio si pente del diluvio perché esso non ha eliminato i veri colpevoli, cioè gli angeli. Il testo invece non parlerebbe mai del giudizio degli uomini, i quali in quanto

eletti andrebbero soltanto a unirsi alle schiere di coloro che si prostrano e adorano «il Signore degli spiriti», cioè Dio. Effettivamente in 60,25 si legge: «Poi ci sarà il giudizio secondo la sua misericordia e la sua pazienza»; come si vede, qui non si parla di giustizia, e in aggiunta 61,9-13 specifica semplicemente che i santi loderanno per sempre il Signore. Ciò permette a Chialà di ritenere che, essendo la giustizia dei giusti frutto soltanto dell'elezione del Signore, agli uomini sarà fatta soltanto misericordia: «Un vero giudizio non ci sarà: i santi sono ormai tutti nell'alto dei cieli che glorificano ed esaltano il Signore degli Spiriti. La completa assenza di uomini condannati è testimoniata dal grido di lode» (255).

Questa tesi è quanto mai suggestiva e non mi farebbe nessuna difficoltà accettarla, se si combinasse con alcune osservazioni almeno apparentemente contrarie, che pur vanno fatte. Infatti, non solo in 61,8 si legge che l'Eletto «giudicherà tutte le opere dei santi nell'alto dei cieli e con bilance misurerà le loro azioni» (il che fa supporre che anche i santi siano oggetto di un giudizio imparziale), ma in 61,10-16 si opera una distinzione tra i santi e i peccatori: questi «saranno pieni di vergogna», mentre quelli «non vedranno più il volto dei peccatori e degli oppressori». È vero che costoro nel contesto vengono semplicemente identificati con i re, i dominatori e i sovrani che dominano sulla terra (cf. 38,5; 46,4-8; 53,5; 55,4; 62,1.3.6; 63,1), ma secondo Chialà questi personaggi non sarebbero altro che metafore degli stessi angeli peccatori, cioè costituirebbero la schiera di Azazel («identificazione»: p. 231 su 53,5). Ciò che fa problema è che in 62,10 si mantiene una distinzione fra di loro e gli angeli incaricati del castigo: cioè, solo a questi secondi è riservato l'appellativo di «angeli». Analogamente in 66,1 si distingue tra «gli angeli del castigo» e la punizione destinata a «tutti coloro che risiedono e abitano sulla terra». Soprattutto in 67,12 si parla del «giudizio col quale sono giudicati gli angeli», che viene spiegato in quanto «è una testimonianza per i re, i dominatori e coloro che possiedono la terra», supponendo perciò ancora una distinzione tra i due gruppi di esseri: da una parte gli angeli ribelli, e dall'altra i re-dominatori. Sicché questi ultimi sembrerebbero intesi in senso proprio, non metaforico, come veri sovrani-oppressori e considerati tutt'al più come fattori esponentziali di una più vasta accolta di peccatori. Resta pur sempre il fatto che in 68,5 si legge chiaramente: «Né angelo, né uomo riceverà la sua parte, eccetto loro», cioè gli angeli ribelli; e in 68,2 si parla esplicitamente del «giudizio degli angeli». In definitiva, però, la stessa tesi di Chialà sembra temperarsi là dove, quasi correggendosi, giunge a concedere che «non si tratta di identificazione precisa dei due gruppi ma di stretta relazione, di *emanazione* o forse di *filiiazione* (forse i re e i potenti sono il frutto dell'unione degli angeli con le donne, cioè i figli degli angeli)» (273). Sembrerebbe essere proprio qui la risposta all'interrogativo problematico che anche il Prof. Paolo Sacchi si pone a p. 11 nella sua Prefazione al volume. Tuttavia, si ha l'impressione che Chialà non abbia forse chiarito bene neanche a se stesso la soluzione del problema, poiché ancora a p. 294 in un apposito *Excursus* egli ribadisce in termini oscillanti che i potenti «non sono semplici uomini... Essi sono alleati degli angeli caduti... Solo tali individui meritano il castigo per il Libro delle parabole, cioè gli angeli caduti».

In conclusione, e nonostante le poche osservazioni avanzate, va detto apertamente che il lavoro di Chialà rappresenta uno strumento di indubbia utilità per lo studio del Libro delle parabole di Enoch, che è un testo fondamentale della letteratura del Secondo Tempio o Medio giudaismo. La preziosità del lavoro, oltre che nella nuova versione del testo, a volte discordante con quella di L. Fusella (*Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento* I [a cura di P. Sacchi] [Torino 1981]), si misura nell'aver riproposto e in parte suscitato con il suo apposito commento (ben superiore per quantità e qualità a quello della citata edizione di *Apocrifi*) una problematica interessantissima per lo studioso non soltanto del giudaismo quanto forse ancor più delle origini cristiane. Non è retorica dire perciò che esso fa davvero onore alla ricerca italiana.

Pont. Università Lateranense
P.za S. Giovanni in Laterano, 4
I-00120 Roma

Romano PENNA

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

An dieser Stelle werden die für *Biblica* eingesandten Bücher verzeichnet. Eine Beurteilung ist damit nicht gegeben. Werke, die von der Redaction nicht ausdrücklich erbeten worden sind, werden nicht zurückgesandt, auch wenn ihnen eine weitere Besprechung nicht zuteil werden kann.

Eingesandte Bücher und Artikel gehen an den Redactor des *Elenchus of Biblica* zur Anzeige nach dessen Gutdünken.

Die Anschrift, an die wir die Sendungen zu richten bitten, ist Schriftleitung *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italien

Alonso Schökel, Luis, with **Bravo**, José María, *A Manual of Hermeneutics*. Further Editing by Brook W.R. Pearson (The Biblical Seminar 54). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 181p. 15,7 x 23,4. £16.95 – \$28.50

Ascough, Richard S., *What Are They Saying About the Formation of Pauline Churches?* Mahwah, NJ, Paulist Press, 1998. 133p. 13,6 x 21,4. \$9.95

Becker, Udo, *Lexikon der Symbole*. Mit über 900 Abbildungen (Herder Spektrum 4698). Freiburg – Basel – Wien, Herder, 1998. 352p. 12,2 x 19. DM 22.80

Bermejo Rubio, Fernando, *La escisión imposible*. Lectura del Gnosticismo Valentiniano (Plenitudo Temporis 5). Salamanca, Universidad Pontificia, 1998. 416p. 17x 24. Paper: Ptas 3.200; cloth: Ptas 3.800

Bernstein, Richard J., *Freud and the Legacy of Moses* (Cambridge Studies in Religion and Critical Thought 4). Cambridge, University Press, 1998. xii-151p. 15,4 x 12,8. Paper: £11.95 – \$18.95; cloth: £32.50 – \$59.95

Bird, Phillis A. (ed.), *Reading the Bible as Women*. Perspectives from Africa, Asia, and Latin America (Semeia 78). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1997. vi-165p. 15,3 x 23,4. \$19.95

Block, Daniel I., *The Book of Ezekiel*. Chapters 25–48 (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament). Grand Rapids, W.B. Eerdmans, 1998. xxiv-826p. 17 x 24,5. \$50.00 – £32.99

Branick, Vincent P., *Understanding the New Testament and Its Message*. An Introduction. Mahwah, NJ – New York, Paulist Press, 1998. 412p. 15,4 x 12,8. \$19.95

Brenner, Athalya – **Fontaine**, Carole R. (eds.), *Wisdom and Psalms* (A Feminist Companion to the Bible – Second Series 2). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 332p. 15,6 x 23,4

Campbell, Barth L., *Honor, Shame, and the Rhetoric of 1 Peter* (SBL Dissertation Series 160). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1998. x-266p. 14,5 x 22,2. \$39.95

Sæbø, Magne, *On the Way to Canon*. Creative Tradition History in the Old Testament (JSOTSS 191). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 401p. 16 x 24. £35.00 – \$57.50

Scheindlin, Raymond P., *The Book of Job*. Translation, Introduction, and Notes. New York – London, W.W. Norton, 1998. 237p. 13,5 x 20,5. \$23.95

Schnelle, Udo, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (THKNT 4). Leipzig, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1998. xxvi-321p. 17 x 23,5. DM 54,—

Schürer, Emil, *Storia del popolo giudaico al tempo di Gesù Cristo*. Volume terzo – tomo secondo. Edizione italiana a cura di Claudio Gianotto (Biblioteca di storia e storiografia dei tempi biblici 13). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1998. 1498p. 15,5 x 23. Lit. 110.000

Schürmann, Heinz, *Il vangelo di Luca*. Parte seconda. Tomo primo: *Testo greco e traduzione. Commento ai capp. 9,51–11,54*. (Commentario teologico del Nuovo Testamento III.2.1). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1998. 515p. 15,6 x 22,5. Lit. 98.000

Seebass, Horst, *Genesis II/1. Vätergeschichte I* (11,27–22,24). Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1997. 222p. 14,5 x 22. DM 59,80 – ÖS 437 – SFr 54,—

Segovia, Fernando F. (ed.), “What is John?” Volume II: *Literary and Social Readings of the Fourth Gospel* (SBL Symposium Series). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1998. xii-361p. 15,3 x 22,3. \$29.95

Smith, Dwight Moody, *La teologia del vangelo di Giovanni*. Traduzione italiana di Saverio Campanini (Lecture bibliche 15). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1998. 235p. 13,7 x 21. Lit. 35.000

Society of Biblical Literature. 1998 Seminar Papers. Part One. Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1998. 523p. 15,3 x 22,9. \$25.00

Society of Biblical Literature. 1998 Seminar Papers. Part Two. Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1998. Pp. 524-1012 15,3 x 22,9. \$25.00

Solivan, Samuel, *The Spirit, Pathos and Liberation*. Toward an Hispanic Pentecostal Theology (Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 14). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 160p. 15,6 x 23,4. £10.95 – \$13.95

Sorci, Pietro, *La festa del perdono*. La parola di Dio nel sacramento della riconciliazione (Interpretare la Bibbia oggi 4.4). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 1998. 110p. 13,5 x 21. Lit. 16.000

Spreafico, Ambrogio, *La voce di Dio*. Per capire i profeti (Studi biblici 33). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1998. 296p. 14 x 21,5. Lit. 34.000

Strus, Andrzej – **Blatnický**, Rudolf (a cura di), *Dummodo Christus annuntietur*. Studi in onore del Prof. Jozef Heriban (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 146). Roma, Libreria Ateneo Salesiano, 1998. 541p. 16,7 x 24. Lit. 60.000

Tabét, Michelangelo, *Teologia della Bibbia*. Studi su ispirazione ed ermeneutica biblica (Studi di Teologia). Roma, Armando Editore, 1998. 267p. 16 x 24. Lit. 35.000

The Two Books of the Chronicles (The Holy Bible. Annotated Critical Translation from the Original Languages by the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum). Tokyo, San Paolo, 1998. vi-356-3*p. 16 x 20,7

VanderKam, James C., *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Measuring Time (The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls). London – New York, Routledge, 1998. viii-136p. 14 x 22,2. £35.00

Vetus latina. *Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel.* 22. *Epistula ad Corinthios I.* 3. Lieferung: Einleitung (Fortsetzung und Schluß). Hrsg. Uwe Fröhlich. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1998. 161-240p. 24 x 32

Vezzoli, Ovidio, *Domenica, giorno del Signore.* Percorsi di lettura biblico-liturgica (Interpretare la Bibbia oggi 4.2). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 1998. 158p. 13,5 x 21. Lit. 21.000

Wander, Bernd, *Gottesfürchtige und Sympathisanten* (WMNT 104). Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1998. xiv-276p. 16,5 x 23,5. DM 178,—

Washington, Harold C. — **Graham,** Susan Lochrie — **Thimmes,** Pamela (eds.), *Escaping Eden.* New Feminist Perspectives on the Bible (The Biblical Seminar 65). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 292p. 15,7 x 23,4. £14.95 — \$19.95

Wénin, André, *Osée et Gomer, parabole de la fidélité de Dieu (Os 1-3)* (Connaître la Bible 9). Bruxelles, Éditions Lumen Vitae, 1998. 64p. 14,8 x 21. FB 220,—

Weren, Wim, *Vensters op Jezus.* Methoden in de uitleg van de evangeliën. Zoetermeer, Uitgeverij Meinema, 1998. 215p. 15,6 x 24. Dfl 39,90 — BF 798,—

Whybray, Norman, *Job* (Readings: A New Biblical Commentary). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 187p. 16 x 24. Cloth: £35.00 — \$57.50; paper: £12.50 — \$19.50

Wray, Judith Hoch, *Rest as a Theological Metaphor in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of Truth.* Early Christian Homiletics of Rest (SBL Dissertation Series 166). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1998. xviii-206p. 14,5 x 22,4. \$34.95

Yamasaki, Gary, *John the Baptist in Life and Death.* Audience Oriented Criticism of Matthew's Narrative (JSNTSS 167). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 176p. 16 x 24. \$35.00

Young, Brad H., *The Parables.* Jewish Tradition and Christian Interpretation. Peabody, MA, Hendrickson Publishers, 1998. xvi-332p. 15,7 x 23,5

Zenger, Erich, u.a., (Hrsg.), *Einleitung in das Alte Testament.* Dritte, neu bearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage (Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie 1.1). Stuttgart, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1998. 548p. 15,5 x 23,1

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

Finito di stampare il 12 giugno 1999

Tip. «Don Bosco» — Via Prenestina, 468 — 00171 Roma